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Academic Programs Council (APC) is chartered to be comprised of nine faculty appointees, four student appointees and four ex-officio, non-voting members. Faculty members participating on the Council during Academic Year 2013 (AY13) are listed in Table 1. Throughout AY13, Professor Karen Hayes-Thumann served as APC Chair, Professor Al Schwarzkopf chaired the Policy and Program sub-committee, and Professor Lee Fithian chaired the Course and Curriculum sub-committee. The Council met during the first week of the month during the Fall on Fridays in Buchanan Hall. However, due to the high volume of requests that came through in Spring, the Council met twice each month (on Fridays) in order to manage the program and course proposals submitted. A total of 162 programs and 553 courses, respectively, were processed in AY13.

Table 1: Faculty appointed to Academic Programs Council, AY13. These members were active in assessing proposals electronically and in communicating deficiencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Sub-Committee</th>
<th>Nominated by</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Hayes-Thumann</td>
<td>Art &amp; Art History</td>
<td>APC Chair</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Schwarzkopf</td>
<td>Management Info Science</td>
<td>Programs Chair</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Fithian</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Courses Chair</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Cusack</td>
<td>Expository Writing Program</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Lifschitz</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Rankin-Hill</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Smith*</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Strevett</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Williams</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex-Officio members include Dr. Nancy Mergler (Provost), Dr. Paul Bell (Vice Provost for Instruction), Matthew Hamilton (Registrar and Vice President for Enrollment and Student Financial Services), and Judy Cain (Coordinator of Curriculum Changes and Academic Publications).

Judy Cain (Coordinator, Curricular Changes and Academic Publications) provided primary staff support for Council. She coordinated proposal inputs with the authors, supported and implemented changes (posts all courses and programs) at and after Council meetings, and who organized the materials ultimately to be sent forward. Jean Ware (Manager of Administration and Operations for Admissions and Records) continued to support the committee this year keeping minutes and providing initial draft summaries. Again, APC did not have the benefit of student representation on the Council this year.

In September, Stephanie Beauchamp from the State Regents met with the committee to review policy changes and share newly implemented forms. In the following semester, the Provost created an ad hoc committee to draft policy change to allow OU-NC and OUHSC to offer undergraduate credit certificates. The APC worked with the Provost to develop initiatives to improve submission and workflow. Newly developed workshops and training sessions will be available each semester, beginning in the Fall 2013, to streamline the process for administrators and staff. These sessions will also help re-enforce the electronic submission process for departments by providing precise directions and information on who to call for help.

APC utilizes a paperless procedure. D2L and CourseLeaf sites provide APC members with all the material required to review, manage, and recommend course and program proposals for approval each
month. The electronic review of proposals expedites APC workflow and allows greater number of proposals to be reviewed during peak (Spring) months.

A significant issue for us this year was that of several colleges changing all of their undergraduate programs. These colleges were: Atmospheric & Geographic Sciences, Earth and Energy, Fine Arts, and Journalism. The College of Arts and Sciences continued their usual pace of 30% of course and program proposals. Changes in the College of Fine Arts (Music) were significant this year as the college upgraded their degree programs and courses to meet accreditation standards. Engineering contributed approximately 15% of the course proposals as they continue to align their courses with new areas of interest/emphasis. Program proposals for AY13 increased 95% over AY12 in both quantity and distribution among colleges. Course proposals for AY13 decreased 26% compared to AY12.

Table 2: AY13 Proposals received by APC for Courses (553) and Programs (162) showing monthly details, summaries by College, and totals.
This year, there was an increase in the number of proposals for Minors. Eighteen proposals were for addition or modification of Minors. Graduate Certificate proposals were significant from last year with thirteen new proposals.

Professor Karen Hayes-Thumann will continue as Council Chair. Professor Al Schwarzkopf will continue to chair the Policy and Program Subcommittee, and Professor Lee Fithian will continue to chair the Course and Curriculum Subcommittee in AY13.

Submitted June 2013
The Athletics Council met five times in 2012-2013. Meeting dates were October 4, November 26, March 1, April 16, and June 11.

2012-2013 Athletics Council membership:

Faculty members: Priscilla Griffith, Susan Hahn, Craig Hofford, Jack Kasulis, Charles Kimball, Joanna Rapf, Larry Regens, and Francene Weatherby.

Staff Members: Clay Wesley and Patrick Hutton

Student Member: OUHSC – Will Douglas; Norman – Mary Morton

Student-athletes – Annie Martin and Patrick Piscitelli

Alumni: Danny Heatly and Sandy Kinney.

Ex Officio: Joseph Castiglione (Athletic Director), Kelly Damphousse (Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA).

Athletics Department: Jason Leonard (Executive Director, Athletics Compliance), Nicki Moore (Senior Associate Athletics Director, Academics), Larry Naifeh (Executive Associate Athletics Director), Luther Lee (Associate Athletic Director, Chief Financial Officer), Brandon Martin (Sr. Associate Athletic Director, Administration).

Secretary: Wendy Plummer (Managerial Associate).

October 4, 2012

At the October 4 meeting, Charles Kimball and Kelly Damphousse provided an orientation to new Council members and reviewed the functions of the Council and its Subcommittees. The Council was established by the University Regents and has the responsibility to advise the President and Athletics Director on matters related to the governance of intercollegiate athletics. Professor Damphousse reminded the Council not to take their positions lightly. He recommended they use the mantra “see something, say something”. Chair Kimball also announced the Subcommittee chairs and assignments for the year:
Subcommittees Assignments
Athletics Council 2012-13

Governance and Compliance
Chair: Sandy Kinney
Francene Weatherby
Clay Wesley
Will Douglas

Academic Integrity
Chair: Charles Kimball
Craig Hofford
Joanna Rapf
Patricia Griffith

Fiscal Integrity
Chair: Larry Regens
Jack Kasulis
Patrick Hutton
Annie Martin

Equity
Chair: Susan Hahn
Danny Heatly
Mary Morton
Patrick Piscitelli

As the new Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR), Professor Damphousse shared information about his background and responsibilities as the FAR. He informed members that he has previously served on the Council as a regular member and learned about the FAR position from his predecessor Professor Connie Dillon. He reminded the Council that in addition to reporting to the University President, he also represents academics to the Athletic Department. He represents OU to the Big XII and meets with other FARs at the Big XII FAR meeting.

Professor Regens reported that for fiscal year 2012 (FY12), the department ended the fiscal year with a balanced budget without benefit of state or university subsidy. He advised the Council that the Athletic Department contributed to University general fund through the academic enhancement fee of $5 per football ticket sold and the Department has pledge another $1 million for the next five years. Coupled with the annual contribution to the University libraries and other indirect revenues, the Athletic Department provided $11.2 million dollars in support of academic programs at the University over the past nine years.

Professor Regens also reported on the FY13 budget and explained that it is conservative in nature and therefore it may change based on bowl games and other items that may come during the athletic seasons. It is designed to allow the department to continue to remain in balance as the year progresses.

Professor Damphousse discussed the document regarding recommendations for appointments to the Athletics Council that was developed and approved during the 2011-12 year. He recommended that the new members on the Council should have a chance to review the policy before the final vote was taken. The Council postponed a vote for the next meeting to allow for review and questions.
Professor Damphousse discussed the other policy recommendations that have been developed and will need to be voted on by the Board of Regents. Those recommendations include changes to policies regarding: missing classes, finals, language regarding participation in championship events and the Olympics. He asked the Council to review the policy recommendations. In addition, the Academic Integrity subcommittee will meet again to discuss the issues in the recommendations.

Athletics Director Joe Castiglione welcomed the Council members and expressed appreciation for the commitment of members to support our intercollegiate program. He welcomed Professor Kelly Damphousse the new Faculty Athletics Representative to the Athletics Council. Additionally, he advised the Council that the Department was available for the Council’s questions and wanted them to be able to form opinions about issues discussed in council meetings because the Department is committed to transparency. He also reported that the Headington Hall project is on time to be completed in fall 2013 and, when it is possible, the Council will get a tour of the new facilities.

Mr. Castiglione advised the Council that he will keep the Council fully informed to the extent possible and will work closely with each subcommittee chair regarding emerging issues. He asked that members work within their subcommittees to find an area that the council can focus on. He would like the Council to be proactive and believes its work could help identify potentially problematic items before they become an issue.

November 26, 2012

A motion was made to approve the Fiscal Integrity Subcommittee Report that was delivered at the last meeting. The motion was approved.

Professor Kimball presented the Academic Integrity Report, which, he explained, is divided into seven sections. He gave a brief overview of each section and identified several areas of interest in the report. Professor Kimball informed the Council that the current Student-Athlete population saw a 15% decrease in the number of special admissions. Additionally, he described the Graduation Success Rate (GSR) used by the NCAA to track student-athlete graduation and advised the Council that based upon the NCAA’s GSR calculation, that for the 2005-06 cohort, student-athletes graduated at the rate of 72%.

Nicki Moore told the committee that the more successful an athlete is in his/her first semester, the better that athlete will do in the future. Additionally, they have found that coaching and sport culture matters when it comes to helping at-risk admissions students are their most successful. For these reasons, the department is taking special measures with incoming athletes. She also told the Council that the Academic Progress Rate (APR) standard will increase to 930 from 900 in the 2014-15 academic year. To continue to comply with the APR requirements the department is making a concerted effort to improve retention and graduation rates. The Department is making a determined effort to track unexcused absences by course.

Dr. Moore also told the Council that her position was changing and the Department had hired a new Associate Athletic Director for Academics, Michael Meade. Her focus would then be on Student Life. In the end, the two positions would allow for focus and effort in each area.

A motion was made and seconded to support provisional approval of the report so members had time to review it at length and ask any further questions of Department staff. The motion was unanimously approved.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the Regent’s Policy changes and Faculty Handbook Policy Recommendations. The motion was unanimously approved. (See Appendix A and B)

Dr. Moore reported that SAAC began a program called Athletes for Athletes, which would help athletes support one another. Additionally, SAAC would like to increase the athletes’ integration into the larger university community so they are working with Student Life to find events on campus to begin this process. Finally, the Council was reminded that SAAC holds general membership meetings that are open if Council members would like to attend. The Executive Council also meets once a month.

Joe Castiglione introduced the Michael Alford the new Senior Associate AD for Development. He also discussed the new position of Associate Athletic Director for Academic Services to be held by Mike Meade. He explained that the position will also report to Provost Nancy Mergler.

Mr. Castiglione reported that the Headington Hall project is proceeding well and that the department will be hiring for the position of Hall Director by the end of January so that the new person can be involved as the facility is finished. Additionally, the Board of Regents has approved the new rowing facility. The project is currently out for bids with architects with construction expected to begin in the spring. Finally, the boathouse project is on hold until the issue of water rights can be resolved.

Kelly Damphousse reported that he attended the Faculty Athletics Representative Association meeting. FARA is working with the NCAA to make sensible changes to the rulebook in an effort to simplify the rules. Also, beginning in the Fall of 2016, the admissions requirement will change to include the requirement that athletes complete ten core courses before their senior year to be eligible for admission to college. The focus is now on helping 9th graders to understand the new rules and how they will affect them.

March 1, 2013

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Academic Integrity Report from the November 2012 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sandy Kinney distributed annual Governance and Compliance report and reviewed the key elements of the report which included highlights of major infraction cases nationally and preventive measures taken by the university, key compliance staff and responsibilities, monitoring policies, rules education practices, and an analysis of secondary violations and waivers.

Jason Leonard reviewed more specifically the Penn State University case because the fines and sanctions imposed in that case were different and that makes it interesting. The sanctions in the PSU case were imposed based on a report paid for by the institution and based on possible criminal acts which is a clear departure from the NCAA’s usual procedure and trial. Mr. Leonard explained that there are several lawsuits pending about the PSU case, so it is still open for discussion as to its final outcome.

Mr. Leonard explained the new NCAA violation structure, which will be going into effect as of August 1, 2013. The new system will have four levels of violations instead of two, major and minor. Additionally, he explained to the council that under the new structure OU’s most recent infraction would have been considered a Level Three (3) violation. Lastly, under the new structure, more accountability will be put on coaches and likely the fines under the system will be 3-5% of the department budget.

A motion was made and seconded to support provisional approval of the report so members had time to review it at length. The motion was unanimously approved.
Professor Regens reported to the Council that the Athletic Department continues to be a self-sustaining program. Among the items he highlighted in the 2012-13 year review, the department saw an increase in licensing fees, multi-media, the Sooner Club program and ticket sales. Additionally, the Department continued to make contributions to the academic programs, with the majority of the funds going to the Norman campus. He reported that the athletics department will provide $5.9 million in funding to the university in the current year, raising the total for the last 12 years to more than $40 million. Finally, OU has signed with the FOX network for 1,000 hours of OU branded programming on existing FOX platforms.

A motion was made and seconded to support provisional approval of the report so members had time to review it at length. The motion was unanimously approved.

Joe Castiglione introduced Michael Meade who joined the staff full-time in December. He also reported that the construction on Headington Hall is progressing nicely as it continues on an aggressive building schedule. It is scheduled to open on August 1 and the inside is 30% completed. In regards to Big XII conference matters, he reported that they are currently happy with ten schools in the conference and are not looking to expand at this time.

Mr. Castiglione also announced that ticket prices will be the same in 2013 as 2012. The department will use the opportunity to begin adjusting giving levels, which will continue over the next five years. There is also a consideration to increase the cost of basketball tickets. Lastly, Mr. Castiglione reported that he will be attending the May Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Kelly Damphousse reported that the NCAA Rules Working Group has provisionally adopted new rules. There will now be a 60-day override period to understand and hear concerns about consequences of the new rules. The vote on the rules will be March 20th.

Mr. Castiglione reported that Professor Damphousse will be the new faculty-in-residence for Headington Hall.

Michael Meade announced that the Student-Athlete Awards Breakfast is scheduled for April 16th from 7:30 – 9:00am. Since the Council will not meet before that time, he will send out a slate of candidates and a poll for the Council to comment and approve the awards before the next meeting.

Danny Heatly reported that he had an opportunity to travel with the men’s basketball team to KSU. During the trip, the bus driver took time to point out that he thought the team was well-behaved and acted like “fine young men”. As an alumnus, Mr. Heatly was very proud of their behavior and he wanted to share that experience with the rest of the Council.

April 16, 2013

A motion to approve the Compliance Report given at the March 1, 2013 meeting was made and seconded. Michael Meade reported that the awards, which the Athletics Council approved through an internet poll earlier in the month, were awarded this morning in an Awards Breakfast. He was impressed with the large turnout and participation from the community.

Francene Weatherby was elected as the Council’s Chair Elect. She will serve as Vice-chair during the 2013-14 academic year and Chair the following year.
Joe Castiglione reported that the Department is moving towards the best graduation rate ever this year. The department measures and reports this rate to the NCAA using the Graduation Success Rate format designed by the NCAA, which takes into account when student-athletes transfer to another school. He attributed the achievement to improved follow up with the coaches and counselors of high-risk students. Additionally, he reported that there are no current concerns about the APR scores being too low, even with the new standards.

Mr. Castiglione told the council that the season ticket holder rate of return has been tracking well and the men’s basketball team has reported 300 new season ticket holders. He reported that Headington Hall is on schedule to be completed. He expects that the furniture will be moved in on schedule in July and the students will move as scheduled in August. He acknowledged the concerns of Council members and the community regarding the reduction of some parking but reported that the studies done on the parking indicate that there will be enough space for all interested parties.

Lastly, Mr. Castiglione reported that the department has hired Tiffany Byrd as a full-time Sports Nutritionist. A new Director of Operations for Headington Hall has also been hired and he will begin work in a few weeks.

Eric Bailey and Juliana Smith reported on the numerous activities of the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC), since Michelle Gascoigne, the current SAAC President, was not able to attend the meeting because of conflicts with her practice schedule. They distributed a list of the various activities that the student-athletes participated in this year, which included Sooner Jr. Athletes for Athletes, Passport to your Future, the Bedlam Blood Battle and a Special Olympic event at the ASA Hall of Fame Stadium. While the participation has been good, Ms. Smith informed the Council that it was the coaches’ support that had the biggest influence on student-athlete attendance at the events.

Kelly Damphousse reported that two of the rules that the Rules Working Group just adopted on March 20th have been suspended. Those rules concerned who can recruit and how much material can be sent to the recruit. The rules will be reviewed again on May 2nd and the committee will decide if they should be maintained, rescinded altogether or amended/revised and sent back for another vote.

Jason Leonard reviewed the policy on Financial Aid Appeal Hearings. Mr. Leonard explained that the appeal hearing is an administrative process to allow all parties to an objective review of financial aid status. He explained that the reason for the changes was to incorporate a less adversarial process, make it easier on Brad Burnett to conduct a hearing (appointments of faculty), and ensure that much of the student code process was reflected in the policy. Mr. Leonard asked the council to approve the changes that have already been approved by the Legal Counsel’s office.

The Council requested time to review the policy and understand the changes. Mr. Leonard will send his report and the policy to the Council by e-mail to allow for any questions and further study. The Council provisionally adopted the rules.

Chair Kimball announced a groundbreaking ceremony for the new rowing facility will at 3:30pm.

June 11, 2013

Charles Kimball reported that the council voted to approve the Financial Aid Hearing Guide through an online vote.
Larry Regens submitted the Fiscal Integrity Report and described the audit process and procedures to include the Internal Audit, the Report of Independent Accountants, the Capital Projects Review, the Financial Reporting and Disclosure to the University, and the Compliance Audit. Prof. Regens also reviewed the FY 14 budget projections, the FY 13 preliminary Budget and the status of various Department capital projects. Professor Regens reported that the independent audit reported no adverse findings and had no recommendations. He reported to the Council that for FY 13, a balanced budget is projected. He noted that the Department is operating with a flat budget in the next fiscal year with a few exceptions and is continuing to support the university academic function. Finally, he advised the Council that the projections for this fiscal year and the preliminary budget for next year are appropriate and necessary and committee was pleased with the work of the department staff. A motion was made and seconded to support provisional approval of the report so members had time to review it at length. The motion was unanimously approved.

Susan Hahn reported that there are currently more female athletes than male athletes. She described the Department’s ongoing monitoring and self-evaluation of equitable goods and services as well as athletic opportunities and financial aid to both men and women. Nicki Moore noted that the department is evaluating the possibility of adding a women’s sand volleyball team. The decision is part of the department continual evaluation of its programs. In this case, beach volleyball might also contribute to a larger effort to recruit for the indoor volleyball program. Additionally, the subcommittee worked with a consultant, Janet Judge, to create a five-year plan and report for the department. The subcommittee toured each facility and noted areas for further improvement. A motion was made to provisionally approve the report so members could further review the report. The motion was unanimously approved.

Joe Castiglione reported that his visit to the Faculty Senate Meeting in May was successful. The faculty and staff have responded favorably to the new ticket options available to them and they also expressed appreciation regarding the funding of the art museum that allows people to attend for free. He reported that the new Headington Hall is running on schedule and was pleased that a tour for the council could be arranged so that the members can see the results. He reminded the Council that 51% of the residents of the new hall will not be athletes.

Mr. Castiglione reported to the Council that a master plan is being developed to address design options for Lloyd Noble Center. There is no master plan at this time for the football stadium, although it has been noted that several universities in the Big XII have made large investments in their stadiums over the past few years.

Finally, Mr. Castiglione reported that the 2012-13 year is looking to be the best academic and athletic year in the school’s history. Seven teams earned Conference Titles. Many teams had their highest GPA’s this year or noted sizeable gains. Additionally, student-athletes logged in more than 3000 volunteer and service hours before the tornados in May and since time many teams and the department has volunteered their time. Overall, Mr. Castiglione reported that it has been a very successful year.

Kelly Damphousse reported that the work over the past year—his first year as the Faculty Athletics Representative—had gone well. He recently returned from the FAR Institute and learned a great deal about the access other FARs have to their respective Athletic Departments. He was pleased to know and report that he has more access to the department and its staff than most other FARs.

Michael Meade reported on the APR scores that had just been released. Additionally, he reported on the academic success of teams in 2012-2013 academic year. Most notably, the student-athletes reported a cumulative GPA of 3.02 for the academic year. Mr. Meade and Prof. Damphousse attribute the academic success to the support of the coaches and their commitment to the academic success of their student-athletes.
Chair Kimball thanked the members who had completed their terms of service on the Athletics Council for their time, effort and numerous contributions. He also thanked all the Council members and support staff for their hard work and support for his work as Chair all year. Following the formal adjournment, members of the Council and several staff members of the Athletic Department moved to Headington Hall for an hour-long tour of the new, state-of-the-art facility.

--------------------

Appendix A

Recommendations on Appointments to the Athletics Council

Background: Regent’s Policy charges the Athletics Council with the responsibility of advising the President and Athletics Director on athletics policy matters. As such, the Athletics Council is invited and encouraged to make recommendations directly to the President regarding athletics policies and programs. Given the increasing scrutiny of intercollegiate athletics, the Athletics Council asserts that it would be prudent for the University to develop clear guidelines on appointments to the Athletics Council that will minimize the potential for conflicts of interest on the Council and insure that Council members are carefully vetted, fully informed and able to perform their responsibilities. With this in mind, the Athletics Council has developed this set of guidelines that future appointing bodies and individuals should follow when making appointments to the Council.

Vetting Procedures:

- If the appointing body has a nominating committee charged with making appointments to the Athletics Council, as is the case for the Norman and HSC Faculty and Staff Senates, then sitting members of that nominating committee should not be considered for appointment to the Athletics Council. The Athletics Council believes that this restriction will help to insure that all nominees for appointment to the Athletics Council receive equal consideration and that potential conflicts of interest and biases are fully explored.

Conflict of Interest:

- The Athletics Council asks that appointing bodies and individuals require all potential appointees to complete the attached disclosure form, which is meant to guide the appointment process. The Council feels strongly that the following circumstances should disqualify nominees from appointment:
  1) The nominee was cited in an NCAA major violation or multiple secondary violations;
  2) The nominee benefits financially as a direct or indirect result of business dealings connected with OU athletics;
  3) The nominee is a sports agent or is personally connected to a sports agent, sports financial advisor, or runner;
  4) The nominee is a current or former employee of the Athletics Department or a family member of a current Athletics Department employee.
• If the answers the nominee provides to questions on the disclosure form raise other concerns about a possible conflict of interest, then the Council requests that the nominating body or individual consult with the Faculty Athletics Representative and/or the Chair of the Athletics Council on the appropriateness of the appointment. A copy of each appointee’s disclosure form should be submitted to the Chair of the Athletics Council at the time the appointment is made. The Council Chair will then share these forms with the Athletics Compliance Department.

Commitment to Service

• Service on the Athletics Council requires a significant time commitment, including four to five meetings each year plus service on at least one subcommittee with commensurate meetings. Appointing bodies and individuals should insure that nominees are willing and able to make this time commitment and that they are prepared to engage seriously in the Council’s work.

**DISCLOSURE FORM**

For Nominees to the OU Athletics Council

1. Do you have an interest in an entity that does business with the Athletics Department? If so, please explain.

2. Have you ever been interviewed for or involved in an NCAA secondary or major violation? If so, please explain.

3. Do you have an interest in or do you know anyone (agent, financial planner, runner) who has an interest in profiting directly from relationships with collegiate or professional athletes?

4. Are you now or have you ever been an employee of the OU Athletics Department?

5. Are you a family member of a current employee of the OU Athletics Department?

6. Do you now or have you ever gambled on a collegiate sporting event? If so, when and what sport?

7. Are there any other issues or circumstances that you or others might perceive as a potential conflict of interest if you were appointed to the Athletics Council? If so, please explain.
Appendix B

**Proposed Policy Changes: Regents’ Policy, Faculty Handbook, Athletics Department**

Attendance and missed exam policies governing student-athletes may be found in three separate policies. These include: 1) Regents Policy; 2) Faculty Handbook; and 3) Athletic Department. As a result of the multiple policies, some discrepancies and issues have emerged. Although not exhaustive, these issues include:

1. The nature of academic oversight of competition schedules and other athletic events that impact class attendance, i.e., *Chief Academic Officer and Athletics Council need to be more actively involved in decisions concerning and oversight over class attendance and missed exams*.

2. To clarify what is considered a “Provost-approved university-sponsored event” and the process for determining which activities qualify.

3. To clarify student-athlete responsibility to notify faculty and providing adequate notice and faculty obligations if this notice is not provided.

4. Distinguishing between notifying faculty about a Provost-approved event versus an athletic department excused absence, *i.e., illness or family emergency, etc.*

Below you will find the current policies followed by proposed changes to those policies, which are intended to address the issues and discrepancies discussed above.

Proposed recommendations for the Athletics Council include modifications in term of appointment for faculty and alumni to provide for more meaningful oversight, changes in Council subcommittee duties to more accurately reflect actual responsibilities, and inclusion of selection criteria and conflict of interest policy for council membership.

I. **Proposed Changes**

a. **Regents Policy**

6.1.7 (new number) **EQUITY AND SPORTSMANSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Council and its Equity and Sportsmanship Subcommittee annually shall review policies related to gender equity and minority issues and sportsmanship and make suggestions or recommendations to the Council.

6.1.9 – **COMPOSITION OF THE ATHLETICS COUNCIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Method of Appointment</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Norman Campus Faculty</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>3 years – 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HSC Faculty Members</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>3 years – 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Alumni Members</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>2 years – 4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.11 – CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Insert Council Recommendations here

6.2.8—ATHLETICS SCHEDULES

The President and the Director of Athletics shall have authority to approve schedules for all intercollegiate athletics events.

6.3.7—POLICY ON MISSED CLASS TIME

A. No intercollegiate athletics events will be scheduled without the advance approval of the Director of Athletics (or the Director’s designee(s)) as follows:

1. Athletics events include the following: All events approved as per Regents’ Policy 6.2.8, NCAA and Conference postseason championship events and with documented satisfactory academic performance, established national championship events (including junior national championships); the Olympic Games (including specific competition, e.g., Olympic Trials from which participants may directly qualify for the Olympic Games); Pan American Games; World Championships; World Cup and World University Games.

2. No intercollegiate athletics event is permitted during scheduled final examination periods with exceptions for Conference and NCAA post-season competition. Practice sessions, including strength and conditioning, shall be limited during examination periods, unless the participating student athletes have completed all their scheduled examinations.

3. No team schedule or individual schedule will be approved if it provides that the team or individual will miss more than the equivalent of ten full class days in any semester, computed as follows:

   (a) when a competition or travel associated with it is scheduled to commence prior to 1:00 p.m., one full day will be considered missed;

   (b) when commencement is after 1:00 p.m., no class days are considered missed because of the way in which student-athletes schedule their classes during their competitive seasons;

   (c) when the return travel from a competition is scheduled to terminate on any day after 1:00 a.m. but before 7:00 a.m., one-half day will be considered missed; and
(d) when the return travel is scheduled to terminate after 7:00 a.m., one full day will be considered missed.

4. In the event that a team schedule or individual schedule will cause a student-athlete to miss more than ten full class days, exceptions to Section A, subsection 3 may be permitted in consultation with the Faculty Athletics Representative for good cause, with justification documented, and satisfactory academic performance by the individual(s) involved.

5. In a questionable situation, the Director of Athletics consult with the Athletics Council.

B. The Director of Athletics or his or her designee will report to the Athletics Council at its first meeting of each academic year on exceptions under Paragraph A, above, occurring during the previous academic year.

C. Attention will be given to all the sports schedules and the worksheets showing time away from campus for all sports. Specifically, the worksheets will show the opposing team or name of the contest, the city and state where it took place, and the date(s) (and starting time, if appropriate). In addition, the worksheet will show clearly each instance in which one-half or a whole day of classes was missed. Any issue(s) regarding full compliance with this policy will be brought to the attention of the Council as a whole.

D. No class time shall be missed for practice activities except in conjunction with away-from-home competition.

E. Student-athletes are responsible for arranging with their instructors for making up any course work missed while participating in athletics events, including making arrangements with their instructors for making up missed tests and examinations in accordance with faculty policies established by the faculty as set forth in the Norman Campus Faculty Handbook.

6.1.7—ATHLETIC COMPETITION

The Council and its Equity and Sportsmanship, Academic Integrity and Student-Athlete Welfare Subcommittee annually shall review intercollegiate sports competition and make suggestions or recommendations as appropriate, on facilities, scheduling, recruiting, rule changes or other matters.

6.1.3—ACADEMIC MATTERS

The Council annually shall review the admission and academic performance of student-athletes. Reports to the Council and/or its Academic Integrity and Student Welfare Subcommittee will include information on admissions, retention, graduations, academic performance, and academic services to student-athletes.
including counseling, tutoring, and the monitoring of classroom attendance and grades. The Council shall report its findings and recommendations to Athletics Department personnel and to the President.

b. Faculty Handbook

4.9 MAKE-UP EXAMINATIONS (OTHER THAN FINAL) DUE TO UNIVERSITY-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES OR LEGALLY REQUIRED ACTIVITIES

The following guidelines have been approved by the Faculty Senate and the UOSA to aid the faculty in determining a policy for make-up exams (other than final examinations) in cases of absences due to participation in University-sponsored or legally required activities. (For the policy on final examinations, see Section 4.7.)

Only Provost-approved university-sponsored activities such as scholarly competitions, fine arts performances, intercollegiate athletics competitions and academic field trips, and legally required activities, such as emergency military service and jury duty, are covered by these guidelines. Faculty, if given notice two class periods or one week (whichever is less) before an exam (including final exams with two weeks notice) or quiz (excluding pop quizzes), should make every effort to find a reasonable accommodation by (a) giving a makeup exam, an early exam, or quiz; (b) changing the exam schedule; or (c) dropping the exam or quiz and increasing the weight of another exam or quiz or other agreed upon approaches acceptable to the instructor and the student, or (d) by identifying a certified testing center. Students missing an exam on account of jury duty must be allowed an accommodation.

NOTICE: If the student and the faculty member cannot agree, normal appeal procedures (faculty to director/chair to college dean to Senior Vice President and Provost) are available to the student and can be followed.

For information about what activities are Provost-approved or how to have activities approved, contact the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

4.7 FINAL EXAMINATION REGULATIONS

If a final examination is given, no faculty member is authorized to depart from the published examination schedule for either a class or an individual without approval, as follows: An examination for the entire class may be rescheduled only with the approval of the Academic Regulations Committee. A request for such rescheduling should be addressed to the Chair of that committee and should carry the endorsement of the department and the dean concerned. Final examinations for a class outside the period set aside under University regulations for final examinations are prohibited. An examination may be rescheduled for an individual student only when required by law, as in the case of jury duty, or in emergencies such as
illness of the student, a serious illness or death in the immediate family, or an unavoidable academic
conflict of compelling importance, including a conflict due to Regents’ approved exceptions for
Conference and NCAA post-season intercollegiate athletics competition (as per section 6.3.7.1 of
Regents’ policy). For such a conflict to be considered as grounds for rescheduling a final examination, the
activity must be directly related to the student’s academic work in the University or a Provost- approved
University-sponsored event. Such rescheduling must have the approval of the instructor or instructors
concerned, the department chair or chairs concerned, and the dean of the college in which the student is
enrolled and should be timed in such a way to avoid compromising the integrity of the examination (Note
1). Final Examination has been defined as follows: an examination that is comprehensive in nature or that
accounts for a greater proportion of the final grade than an exam given during the semester.

4.19 CLASS ATTENDANCE

STUDENTS

Students are responsible for the content of courses in which they are enrolled. Specific policy concerning
attendance requirements and announced and unannounced examinations is the responsibility of the
individual instructor. Students have a responsibility to inform faculty prior to absences whenever
possible. Faculty should make every effort to find a reasonable accommodation for students who miss
class as a result of participation in Provost-approved University-sponsored activities or legally required
activities such as emergency military service. Students missing class on account of jury duty must receive
such an accommodation.

c. **Revised Athletics Class Attendance Policy (2012)**

The Athletics Class Attendance Policy approaches the issue differently, focusing primarily on the
repercussions for the student-athlete who is not meeting their scholastic responsibilities. Thus, few
changes are necessary to reconcile the Athletics Class Attendance Policy with the others discussed. Only
if the other policies are amended, would the Athletics Policy be required to change, as it references both
the Regents Policy and the Norman Faculty Handbook. Among the most significant differences are:

a) The two day notice requirement for student-athletes regarding missed class and missed
exams should be changed to two class periods or one week (whichever is less) with the
exception of a final examination which requires a minimum of two weeks notice (no
exceptions).
b) Copying the Provost on all missed class notification as a result of Provost-approved
University-sponsored activity.
c) Athletics policy should require a minimum of two weeks notice for any missed final
examination which occurs as a result of NCAA post-season or conference competition.
d) Policy should include a statement that informs student-athletes that if notification regarding
exams or missed class does not meet this policy, that faculty members and instructors are not
obligated to provide an excuse as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook.
All meetings were held in Evans Hall, Provost’s Conference Room 3:30-5:00 pm, 3rd Monday of the month.

**BUDGET COUNCIL CHARGE:** to recommend to and advise the President and other appropriate administrators on matters concerning fiscal policies and resources of the University. Its purpose is to provide on continuing basis continuity and balance in budgetary planning and execution within the University. The Budget Council shall also report each semester to the Faculty Senate on matters concerning fiscal policies and resources of the University.

**MEMBERSHIP**

*Faculty Senate Appointees (3 years)*
- Max Forester, Mathematics (2012-15) forester@math.ou.edu
- Susan Hahn, University Libraries (2010-2013) – shahn@ou.edu, 325-4231
- Halterman, Ronald, Chemistry and Biochemistry (2012 – 15) rhalterman@ou.edu
- Bruce Mason, Physics and Astronomy (2011-2014) – bmason@ou.edu, 325-3961 ext. 36227

*Staff Senate Appointees (3-year appointments)*
- Erin Wolfe, University Research Cabinet (2011-14) ewolfe@ou.edu, 325-3926
- Elizabeth Gatewood, Printing, Mailing and Document Services (2010-13) egatewood@ou.edu, 325-4176

*Presidential Appointments (i.e. Admin)*
- Tom Woodfin, Chair, Landscape Architecture (2011-14) 325-2299
- Craig Hayes, Prospective Student Services 2010-13, rchayes@ou.edu 325 2151

*Staff Senate Appointees (3-year appointments):*
- Elizabeth Gatewood, Printing, Mailing, and Document Services (2010-2013) – egatewood@ou.edu, 325-4176
- Erin Wolfe, University Research Cabinet 2011-2014) – ewolfe@oui.edu, 325-3926

*UOSA Appointments (1-year appointment):*
- Matt Epting
- Laura Shapiro

*Ex-officio, nonvoting members:*
- Nancy Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost – nmergler@ou.edu, 325-3221
- Nick Hathaway, Vice President, Administrative and Executive Affairs – nhathaway@ou.edu, 325-3916

**FALL 2012**

Mon. Sept 17 Linda Anderson – Director OU Budget Office
- Mark Jones – Associate Director OU Budget Office

Mon. Oct 15 Danny Hilliard – Vice President for Governmental Relations

Mon. Nov 19 Kelvin Droegemeier – Vice President for Research

Mon. Dec 17 No meeting – speaker cancellation
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, September 17, 2012  3:33-4:54 pm

Present:  Absent:
Max Forrester  UOSA Student Appointees
Beth Gatewood  Presidential Student Appointee
Susan Hahn
Ron Halterman
Bruce Mason
Nancy Mergler
Erin Wolf
Tom Woodfin
Linda Anderson
Mark Jones

Tom Woodfin (Chair) called meeting to order at 3:34 pm.
1. The 2012-2013 schedule of speakers was reviewed.
2. The charge to the Budget Council from the Faculty Senate was reviewed.
3. Linda Anderson and Mark Jones provided an overview of the University’s budgeting process.
   Handouts included an overview of the annual operating budget and the several sources of revenue as well as the State of Oklahoma General Revenue Fund Sources for 2012.

The budget process runs from fiscal year July 1 – June 30 annually. The annual process involves budget discussions beginning a year ahead. A rolling 5-Year Plan is discussed during a summer retreat engaging the Deans, Provost, and University President. From the budget discussions and requests, a compiled report is provided to the Board of Regents. Also included is a Needs Survey detailing proposed fixed cost increases is conducted in October prior to the Fiscal Year requests.

This report is presented to the legislature in January prior to the requested Fiscal Year expenditure budget with the Chancellor serving as advocate for an “appropriately-aggressive request” that exhibits both constructive and useful budget concerns. The legislature then decides how to allocate higher education expenditures throughout the state by mid-May prior to the beginning to the next fiscal year on July 1.

Monthly revenue reports are received from the state, typically by the Vice-President for Governmental Relations. However monthly revenues are less accurate in terms of predicting revenue trends than
quarterly assessments. The data tables provided by Anderson and Jones illustrated comparative funding and budget expenditures from as far back as 1992 so that long-term trends are more easily understood.

No capital construction costs are included in the operating budget figures. Discussion ensued about revenue sources for the University with a reminder that the Budget Council cannot just ask for more funding for a particular project or area of interest. Such request must either identify new revenue sources or the Committee will simply be advocating a re-allocation from other funding commitments.

Extended discussion revolved around the increased revenue generation from research on-campus and with the robust 2012 enrollment increase. STEM disciplines are also receiving national attention and may represent potential revenue generation by the individual colleges.

It was recommended that the Budget Council’s report from two years ago on revenue stream generation be consulted by members of the Committee.

The political environment in which higher education is now operating presents challenges in terms of addressing the data point of the earning power of a college graduate vs. a non-graduate. The University and all the colleges must address the political assumption that appears to be widely accepted that the University can continue to do what it’s doing with less funding, can find ways to deliver excellence more cheaply and deliver that excellence more efficiently. Example efforts by other universities of on-line education were discussed, as were MOOCs (massively open on-line courses).

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 pm.

**Monday, October 15, 2012 3:35-4:50 pm**

Present: Max Forester, Beth Gatewood, Susan Hahn, Ron Halterman, Bruce Mason, Nancy Mergler, Erin Wolf, Tom Woodfin

Absent: Linda Anderson, Mark Jones

GUEST: Danny Hilliard, Vice-President for Governmental Affairs

Tom Woodfin (Chair) called meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

1. Introduction of VP Hilliard.
2. Linda Anderson provided OMES Oct. 9 update publication on General Revenue Collections in September.
3. Dr. Mergler requested that Linda Anderson provide a statistical chart of Texas and Kansas percentage of revenue streams including Higher Education to compare with Oklahoma’s revenue sources.

VP Hilliard provided an overview of the next fiscal year with a handout (attached) that covered

1) Revenues & 5% monies – a generally optimistic outlook for slight growth but essentially unknown until after the Dec. 18 Higher Education budget qualification.
2) The Rainy Day Fund – which has seen little rain and could be utilized to fund repairs to the State Capitol building.

3) Total Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2013 – that will increase 3.8% over FY 12 due primarily to estimated increases in gross production taxes from natural gas & oil.

4) FY 2014 Fiscal Considerations – multiple scenarios for impacts to state higher education will continue to be projected depending upon state income tax elimination efforts, volatility in natural gas prices, Capitol Building emergency repairs, etc.

Mr. Hilliard expressed cautious optimism that the strength of the relationship between the University leadership and political leadership in the Legislature will provide multiple opportunities for the University of Oklahoma to continue to excel and provide academic leadership to the citizens of this state.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm when Chairman Woodfin ceased posing unanswerable political questions, all of whom were taken, fortunately, with good humor by Mr. Hilliard.

**Monday, November 19, 2012 3:32-4:47 pm**

Present: Max Forester Beth Gatewood Susan Hahn Ron Halterman Bruce Mason Nancy Mergler Tom Woodfin

Absent: Linda Anderson

GUEST: Kelvin Droegemeier, Vice-President for Research

Tom Woodfin (Chair) called meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

4. Review & approval of October minutes
5. Linda Anderson provided OMES Nov. 13 update publication on General Revenue Collections in October.

VP Droegemeier provided the Council members with copies of his presentation entitled “Preparing for Challenging Budget Times”

1. Pressures on higher education for research efforts include unfunded compliance mandates for monitoring federal research contracts, the shrinking state appropriation as percentage of total university budget, unrecovered indirect costs left unpaid by agencies (~ $10 million per year at OU) and that it costs $.20 to get each $1.00 of federal research funding.
2. Comparisons of the OU Norman and HSC campus research funding to major public universities nationally in AY 2008-09 from NSB Companion to 2012 S&E Indicators.
3. “The DC Conversation” topics include:
   a. Debt and deficit control
   b. STEM education reform
   c. Regulatory environment
   d. Cost containment in higher education
   e. International collaboration
f. Global competitiveness with US superiority
g. Short-term view / practical outcomes
h. Performing only research that “really matters”

4. The VPR’s roles are to continue to engage faculty in locating and creating opportunity, building collaborations internally and externally, creating incentives and rewards, providing end-to-end proposal and grant services, integrating instruction and research, touting achievements, recruiting, and retaining the brightest faculty. All are challenges to be accomplished regardless of budget pressures.

5. Norman Campus research expenditures have grown from $ 55 million + in 2003 to more than $93 million in 2012. More than ten percent of that growth can be tied directly to Strategic Initiative Hires of faculty to the university.

6. The VPR Budget (~ $ 18 million annually) is arbitrarily set to the amount of indirect cost recovery (IDC) from external grants and contracts. The distribution of IDC is much wider than just the units that are generating the grants – a policy decision by the VPR and Provost’s Office to engage more faculty in more scholarly research. Droegemeier would like to increase the IDC going to Principal Investigators to encourage leadership initiatives but cannot afford to increase the percentage beyond 20% at this time.

Question: Is the University increasing STEM educational efforts? Yes, STEM pedagogy is being emphasized and added to the undergraduate experience with engaged learning techniques. More Federal funding for STEM is on the horizon and the VPR’s office will seek to encourage significant changes by faculty to improve STEM education and scholarship.

Question: How to remain at the cutting edge of research? By collaboration and leveraging within the university as well as regional initiatives and university consortia. NSF has emphasized interdisciplinary teams and this is impacting the engagement of the social/behavioral/economic sciences especially. More private industry and applied R&D agencies need to be linked to OU researchers for innovation and wealth creation and for economic diversification.

Question: Sustainability of faculty start-up packages in light of budget constraints? It is more difficult for departments to individually fund new faculty since start-up packages are now centralized through the Provost and VPR’s offices in conjunction with departments. Competition for faculty is fierce and should not be based solely on the value of start-up funding.

Question: If the university pursues more defense research and specifically classified research, how will the Tenure and Promotion policies be adjusted? At this point, little of this has occurred on the Norman Campus and typically the review of research productivity and publications will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. It is critical that the Provost, VPR, and the academic unit go into such situations with eyes open to reduce surprises down the road.

The VPR’s office has engaged in extensive scenario planning to estimate the impacts of potential Congressional inaction on budget sequestration. Changes in research expenditures and income depend on whether sequestration measures are balanced across all federal agencies or whether cuts occur primarily in defense or non-defense spending. The impact on OU R&D spending from those scenarios ranges from 10% to as much as 28% through FY 2015. Fortunately, the VPR has been engaged in budget contingency planning for months and has established priorities for how available funds will be re-purposed to continue to perform leading-edge scholarship.

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 pm.
Monday, February 18, 2013  3:34-4:44 pm

Present:
Max Forester
Susan Hahn
Ron Halterman
Bruce Mason
Laura Shapiro
Matt Epting
Nancy Mergler
Mark Jones
Linda Anderson
Tom Woodfin

GUEST:  Guy Patton, President and CEO of OU Foundation

Tom Woodfin (Chair) called meeting to order at 3:34 pm.
- Review & approval of October minutes
- Introduction of Mr. Patton

Mr. Patton provided a brief biography of his experience prior to returning to OU five years ago. He has long ties with the OU Foundation from his student days at the University and 25 years’ experience with Fidelity Investment Company. Mr. Patton provided an extensive overview of the OU Foundation and the expectations and roles of university endowments. His enthusiasm for the Foundation and financial management of the resources was evident throughout the discussion.

Dramatic changes have occurred in managing the endowment – more sophisticated information technologies and tracking of accounts is possible. The Foundation, founded in 1944, is required by law to be a separate corporation from the University of Oklahoma. This legal standing follows the dictum that “private money should be additive” to state funding of public universities.

Three roles for fundraising:
1) Get the money – primarily the role of the University
2) Manage the money – a primary responsibility of the Foundation
3) Disburse the money – the second primary responsibility of the Foundation

UPMIFA: Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act
sets a very long horizon on institutional investments. According to Patton, this means essentially the Foundation looks for long-term equities.

Two forms of gifts received by the Foundation:
1) Those restricted by purpose by donor – these can either be expendable (i.e. allowed to spend until entirely used – typical for building fund donations) or endowed (i.e. whereby only the interest dividends can be expended).
2) Deferred giving – most often these are fungibles such as real estate, oil and gas mineral rights, art whose value is assessed and may be sold as soon as feasible since the Foundation does not hold specific expertise in the management of such assets. Planned giving may also be in the form of annuitized giving providing income to the donor until their death. Planned gifts are typically $50,000 or greater.
The present OU Foundation total is around $1.125 billion with approximately 800 million endowed and approximately 300 million expendable. This fund total includes the University, the Health Sciences Center, and the Athletics Department. Annually the Foundation contributes approximately $140 million to the $1 billion annual budget with $40 million from endowments and $100 million of expendable investments.

Q: What is the Foundation’s relationship with various campus units such as Colleges and Research?  
A: The Foundation is a centralized lean organization of 24 staff that works both within the Foundation office and at the College level. Business managers in each college have access to their appropriate Foundation funds and perform transactions on a daily basis with those funds.

Q: What is the OU Foundation overhead on funds?  
A: The management fee for funds is 1% for endowments but there are no transaction fees charged.

At present, there is a very high giving rate and this indicative of a high level of trust by donors in the University’s stewardship of their donations. The Foundation is constantly aware that using the money appropriately to the donor’s intention is paramount.

Q: What financial instruments are used to generate income?  
A: There are no risk-free rates of investment but with sub-zero interest rates, benchmarking is quite difficult. Generating any kind of income requires an additional risk. 80% of EIP (the expendable pool of funds) is in liquid 6-month maximum instruments in order to retain maximum flexibility.


The meeting adjourned at 4:44 pm.

**Monday, March 18, 2013 3:35 – 4:50pm**

The meeting took place at the Provost’s Conference Room, first floor, Evans Hall. Those in attendance include the following members of the Council:

Present: Max Forester  Beth Gatewood  Susan Hahn  Ron Halterman  Bruce Mason  Nancy Mergler  
Missing: Linda Anderson  Matt Epting  Nick Hathaway  Craig Hayes  Mark Jones  Laura Shapiro  Erin Wolfe  Tom Woodfin

Susan Hahn (Chair) called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

Guest Speaker: Daniel Pullin, Vice President for Strategic Planning & Economic Development

Economic Development, 15 years.

Economic development as an academic pursuit? Long-term period from basic research to economic engine. Portfolio approach for ideas to develop.
Multi-campus programming management. (Strategic Planning as a sidebar)

Corporate Engagement as a service to the private sector? Work more quickly with corporate partners. Work with the corporations that have offices on OU. 15 of these. Do not ask for corporate money; ask for joint return on efforts.

Technology development – Licensing and venture funding. Patent cost review. Some non-profit output. Students have done this with software. They get 35% of commercial outcomes.

CCEW – Originally to move IP through the pipeline to get it out. Coordinate students, faculty, and alumni to work on particular projects. Real-world projects for students, scholarship. Better engagement of the alumni, for “intellectual check”. Holistic view of problems and development. This is applied to a wide range of uses, not just technology transfer.

Research Campus – 500+ Private jobs with about 2x average state income. 300+ Government jobs.

Technology office – 230 patents, 36 companies (Since 1998). 60 licenses to other companies. More than half are in Health Sciences.

FY 10 and on making a profit most years. Need to say no to faculty members to make the office make a profit. Try to build a relationship with faculty to keep supporting them. Focus on technologies chosen as a potential benefit. Profits, 15% to the office, 20% to a “growth fund”, 35% to faculty, and some to VPR, college, and department.

CCEW Impact – 250 students from 10 colleges. 80 students apply for 12 spots, with a 3.6 average GPA. 60% of students stay in Oklahoma right after. Include academic study of entrepreneurial process. Experience count towards elective. This is an important aspect of place-based education. Open up the program beyond a student intern experience. Launch a center on 3PP for workspace for the colleges to use.

So, this excites people coming to OU. “This week at the Center”, something going on that is new. March 25 – May 5.

Entrepreneurial curriculum is growing in K-12?

VPR/CCEW incubation connections. Working with the CARD program.

Master Lease funding is out of one-time money. Sequester funding may impact Advanced Programs and military graduate students. Major impact on Research Programs. Aviation program and shutting down the airport tower. (Thank you Bruce Mason for his notes)

Updates on State Finances

Linda Anderson and Mark Jones were unable to attend -- Linda e-mailed the state revenue report

Of note:
• Higher than expected income tax refunds and a continued drop in natural gas production reduced the General Revenue Fund in February
• Feb GRF totaled $254.6 million which is $28.9 million (10.2%) below collections from Feb 2012
• GRF is $20.4 million (7.4%) lower than the official which the FY 2013 budget is based
• Sales tax collections came in a healthy pace
• Sales tax collections for Feb 2013 increased by 4.5% over Feb 2012
• Up 6.5% over the first 8 months of the fiscal year

Big Picture – revenues for the budget are still on pace above estimated levels

No new business
Meeting adjourned at 4:50PM

Monday, April 15, 2013 3:34 – 4:38pm

The meeting took place at the Provost’s Conference Room, first floor, Evans Hall. Those in attendance included the following members of the Council:

Max Forester
Beth Gatewood
Susan Hahn
Ron Halterman
Bruce Mason
Nancy Mergler
Mark Jones
Linda Anderson

Missing:
Matt Epting
Nick Hathaway
Craig Hayes
Laura Shapiro
Erin Wolfe

Tom Woodfin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.

Guest Speaker: Luther Lee, CFO, OU Dept. of Athletics

The Athletics Department is fully integrated into the university system and undergoes at least 2 audits annually, from the NCAA and internally. Fiscal Year 2012 the AD had a balanced budget, its 13th consecutive year to achieve this. The FY 2013 budget is conservatively balanced with no assumed bowl games or NCAA tournament appearances. No state, university, or student fees are counted in the AD budget. The OU Athletic Department is one of only 7 programs in the US receiving no external funding.

The Athletic Department annually sends $7 – 8 million to the University. An Academic Enhancement Fee of $5 per football ticket contributes $2 million per year. Details are available for viewing. Other programs include support for the Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art to provide free admission for all visitors. The new Headington Hall is scheduled for completion in July/August 2013 and will house half athletes and half general population students with 5 retail street front businesses on the ground floor.

The Fox Sports partnership creating a regional sports network with 1500 – 2000 hours of OU sports programming annually has been a profitable venture. Sixty to seventy OU students and athletes are involved with Sooner Vision and learning how sports programming is produced.
Question: What are the threats to the Athletic Department’s future success?

Answer: Compliance is an on-going effort with 9 full-time staff dedicated to ensuring all requirements are met. The primary issue with the part of compliance that cannot be controlled by coaches and their student-athletes. Another threat is the escalating cost of competing at Division 1: improved facilities, coaches, scholarships are all dependent upon the generosity of supporters and merchandising of OU brand.

Question: Is all marketing in-house?

Answer: Yes – the OU Athletic Department works with Public Affairs as well. There are four full-time employs and one student worker that provide the outreach and establishments of contracts and other agreements.

Updates on State Finances by Linda Anderson

The statewide bond issue for buildings in mid-2000s had the debt service taken care of within the larger state budget until 2012. The governor wrote out this interest payment and the university now must deal with $ 2-3 million annual to address this debt service.

No new business

Meeting adjourned at 4:38 pm

Monday, May 20, 2013 3:32 – 4:37 pm

The meeting took place at the Provost’s Conference Room, first floor, Evans Hall. Those in attendance included the following members of the Council:

Present:
Max Forester
Beth Gatewood
Bruce Mason
Nancy Mergler
Tom Woodfin

Missing:
Ron Halterman
Susan Hahn
Mark Jones
Linda Anderson
Matt Epting
Craig Hayes
Laura Shapiro
Erin Wolfe
Tom Woodfin (Chair) called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

Guest Speakers:
Nick Hathaway, Executive Vice-President and VP for Administration & Finance
Chris Kuwitzsky, Associate Vice-President for Administrative & Finance and CFO

Handout of a financial report prepared for the Council that tracked the ten-year history of the University’s financial structure in the following line graphs:
“Total Financial Resources, Revenues, Expenses, and Direct Debit”
“Cash & Equivalents and Unrestricted Net Assets”
“State Appropriations Per Resident FTE Student”

This chart elicited questions concerning the decline in state support per resident student that has resulted in a $2500 difference between HEPI Adjusted figures and actual OU state support.
“Tuition and Fees Per Resident and Nonresident FTE Student”

The differential between resident and non-resident students was $9649 in 2012 attributable to state appropriations received.

“Appropriations, Tuition, and Fees (net) Per Student”

State appropriations and net tuition & fees were equal in 2008 and have diverged more each year with a $2342 difference in 2012. Net tuition and fees accounted for $8923 per student while state appropriations provided only $6581 per student. An illustration of the ‘privatization of public education’ when tuition and fee increases are required to meet the costs of university education that state funding no longer supports.

“Operating Revenues – Contribution Ratios”

State appropriations have declined from 26.3% to 15.6% of operating revenues 2002 – 2012. Tuition & fees now account for 31.3% from 17.6% in 2002. A 5% decline in Grants & Contracts reflects the loss of the FAA Training and Postal Service Training Programs from OCCE.

“Operating Expenses – Utilization Ratios”

Updates on State Finances – no updates were provided

New business – Nominations for Council Chair for 2013-2014 were solicited. Ron Halterman accepted the nomination and was approved by acclamation. Current Chair Tom Woodfin will work with Ron over the summer to ensure a smooth transition. Special thanks to Susan Hahn, immediate past Chair, for her diligence in creating protocols and a documentation trail for the Council. Beth Gatewood has served her term on the Council and we appreciate her service to the University on the Council. We will look forward to her replacement from OU Staff.

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm. This was the final meeting of the OU Budget Council for the year. By this time, the terrible destruction of an F5 tornado had crossed through Moore, OK.

So ends the annual 2012-2013 Budget Council Report
Members: Juanita Gamez Vargas, Chair; Kirby Gilliland; Hans-Peter Wachter; Jenny Barnhouse, Michael Buckley, Rebecca Cook, Kenny Inman, Cheryl McCain, Chris Elliot, Irene Karpiak

Ex-officio Members: James Pappas, VP University Outreach; Nancy Mergler, Senior VP & Provost; Kelvin Droegemeier, VP for Research; T.H. Lee Williams, Graduate College Dean

Vacancies: None

Meetings: October 25, 2012; November 28, 2012; February 4, 2013; April 13, 2013;

Transition: Juanita Gamez Vargas was nominated, approved by the Council and began serving officially as Chair of the CE Council in October 2012.

October 25, 2012 Minutes

Topic: Emerging Certificates and MOOCs

Dr. Pappas reviewed the agenda, distributed the Membership and Charge of the Council, Faculty Senate Report, February minutes and Outreach department brochures. The committee viewed the documents, with special attention to the Faculty Senate report, to begin discussing topics for future Council meetings. Dr. Pappas mentioned his presentation at the State of Outreach meeting and a presentation he made to the Deans regarding certificates that he would be glad to share with the group.

Mike Buckley inquired about the certificate issue that Dr. Pappas mentioned. Dr. Pappas shared his PowerPoint presentation to the Deans on Certificates. The fastest growing credential in higher education is certificates. There are two types of certificates, credit and non-credit, with most non-credit coming out of Continuing Education. Credit can come out of Continuing Education or a department. If being offered as part of a residential student audience, it will be offered in the curriculum. If it is being offered to an external group, it will be through Continuing Education. There is also interest in banking credits that later could be used for a degree. The IT industry has been the impetus for the growth of certificates. A certificate provides a special skill set for those applying for jobs; employers recognize the added value of a certificate to a degree. Now employers are reimbursing tuition for certificate programs. Certificates are leading toward degree and helping students discover their interest level. Potential students, who may not have normally come to the University, are now coming to pursue a certificate. For a long time it was a certificate vs. a minor.

The latest issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education lists about 30 ways we should reinvent higher education. The third item, because of grade inflation, etc., shows we are less interested in grades and more interested in “badges”. Certificates are becoming a more important currency and we are being asked to create more certificates. The same steps are required whether you are getting a certificate or a degree approved. We have a process where we have a faculty and staff committee look at non-credit certificates, but it is much less rigorous. Discussion included questions such as: Should the University have a level of recognition of non-credit certificates and experience, as part of the accreditation process? Does it meet the standards? There is a process for approval through ACE, an external agency. The MOOCs (massive open online course) were also brought into the
Discussion. Questions such as: If you go through and complete the course, does the institution give recognition of that? How do we monitor? Taking open courses will be an issue, how does an institution accept courses taken from a MOOC? How do you assess what is learned? Who gets to the money in federal financial aid for the students? They are essentially running their business from the pass-through from those students. Students are sometimes left out of the equation; we need to understand the business model.

Discussion continued regarding “whether transcripted credit is a better experience for the student than non-transcripted credit” and found that is not necessarily true. Rather, the question may be “has this work met certain standards needed for credentialing?” Those seeking certificates may be seeking simply professional development or considering seeking a degree. Undergraduate certificates are becoming more important to students than a minor emphasis. What if we take a group of courses that are aggregated and labeled them as a certificate, even if those courses are part of a regular course degree – not unlike a minor – just relabeled it? Would faculty say this aggregate of courses is acceptable? Would the Intellectual expertise say that these courses “are good enough to be called a bachelor’s degree or certificate from OU?”

The suggestion was made to bring in the library dean for a session on the library’s newest efforts with technology and student demands. However, the discussion continued on the philosophical question if it is possible to find a good quality open access course and a good assessment instrument, is it more important to have the OU experience, or more important to have the knowledge it creates? Is that better than a poorer course at OU? Dean Lee Williams stated that the scholarly experience, how it all fits together, is classically the idea of the graduate degree.

Future agenda items discussed: Different types of programs and responding to the marketplace, yet clarifying our standards. How do we respond as an esteemed institution and remain viable in a changing world?

Dr. Pappas will meet with Dr. Vargas to create an agenda. Belinda will schedule the next meeting.

November 28, 2012 Minutes Topic: Future trends in degree completion & HE

Dr. Pappas shared a video of Mark Milliron, the new Chancellor of Western Governors University of Texas (formerly of Gates Foundation), regarding future trends, new technologies, learning strategies, analytics, etc. The video was of a recent keynote presentation by Dr. Milliron at the Association for Continuing Higher Education conference titled “Emerging Insights on Education, Innovation, Technology, and the Road Ahead”. Dr. Vargas researched some of the information mentioned in the video and shared articles with the CE Council. The Council was quite pleased with the information provided and asked for copies. The video is owned by Sonic Foundation, Dr. Pappas will find out of the members can get a copy, knowing that there may be a charge. Distance learning models presented are doable; however, we do not have places on our campus to discuss these types of ideas. How do we deal with this as an institution? Outreach has been a leader in this area; how can we help position CCE to be an exemplar for the university? How do we help move the traditional university as a whole? Last year we had a professional development session on how to teach online. There were two very different audiences present – those that are naive and the advanced. We should look at doing professional development sessions, what is the next step beyond a traditional online course? Undergraduate students are no longer traditional. Dr. Milliron mentions one of his targets as the three million in Texas who have not finished their
degree. We have already identified those in Oklahoma that do not have a completed bachelor’s degree. After meeting with the President of Langston University, Dr. Droegemeier feels that the underrepresented groups in Oklahoma could benefit from this. When Paul Risser was Chancellor at OSRHE, he worked towards creating the Reach Higher Program, a program for degree completion. Dr. Pappas sat on the committee and offered advice since OU’s CCE offers more online degrees than all other institutions combined. OSHRE reviewed OU’s CCE website, saw our degree and copied it. We offered to take to the lead, market jointly and share the coursework. Our help was not taken so we stepped back and did not hear from them. The Regents moved forward with Reach Higher and housed it at Northeastern State University. It ran for a while but OSHRE has now taken it back. One reason OSHRE may not have collaborated with OU was the bureaucracy, it is an elaborate process getting distance courses approved which takes about 18-24 months.

Concern was expressed that in our haste to make education accessible online, the students are going to miss out on what happens in the classroom, the interaction with each other. A blended model would be a solution. How can you unbundle the learning experience to allow portions to be done on mobile devices? A lot of communication takes place on D2L; however, there is little face-to-face communication.

The Council will continue to discuss ways that CCE could pioneer a new system. CCE has more flexibility and is less traditional than the credit course model. Could we do some type of experiment and make it known, perhaps with more faculty development? Dr. Pappas suggested that we bring in Ray Schroeder from Illinois, a leader in the field on online information to discuss such issues. It was suggested that at the next meeting, the Council continue to discuss this timely issue.

Belinda will schedule the next meeting in January or February. The meeting was adjourned.

February 4, 2013 Minutes

Topic: Update on HE trends

Dr. Pappas shared a “Higher Education Trends” report he had prepared for the Executive Officers. Most of the information came from an Education Advisory Board meeting he attended. There is a lot of pressure on higher education and criticism.

- Four publications shown on the first page - talked about the universities’ broken business model, e.g., uncontrolled cost increases, graduates lack of critical skills, irrelevant scholarship.
- Disruptive technology – MOOC. There is a rush by universities to get into MOOC business and finding ways to monetize the MOOCs. If you take the course and the test, you get the fee.
- Flipping the classroom - get information from online courses, and interact in the classroom.
- Unbundle the degree - students can save money taking basic courses online, rather than on campus.
- Noodle is one-stop-shopping for students with customized school recommendations from “Wizard”.
- Students are opting for build-as-you-go credentials. Modular degree structure creates value for students, employers and the university. Students are seeking a 2nd masters in a field of interest (rather than a Ph.D.) and/or stackable certificates.
- Online options and a broad slate of electives accommodate diverse needs allowing flexibility for students.
- OU takes three years to get a degree program through the system, then it must go through the Regents. Many for-profits created affiliates and online enablers that assist in getting an online degree – they control everything but degree content.
- Overview of trends in federal regulation of higher education. Problems – most higher education agency authorities are unclear about state authorization and reciprocity efforts. Some states
have learned if they charge for licensure it is a free revenue stream. Licensed in all states will
cost big bucks. Many states try to protect small schools. Attempt at reciprocity suggests that if
you belong to that group and are authorized, you would have reciprocity across the states.
WICHE would give reciprocity to those involved in WICHE, same for APLU/AASCU.
- Final portion is a snapshot in time of the leading MOOC providers.

Dr. Karpiak suggested that Dr. Pappas talk with department chairs about these matters. Dr. Pappas
did share this report with the Executive Officers; however, the President is not in favor of changing
how the university operates - he will sustain our traditional university.

Dr. Pappas distributed The Chronicle “The End is Not Nigh for Colleges”. Dr. Buckley suggested
that perhaps we can wait until it all shakes out; he feels that the sky is not falling on higher
education. Dr. Pappas may share “The Student as Consumer” with the Council.

Dr. Vargas will accept any offers of agenda items for the next Council meeting now or later via e-
mail. Dr. Williams suggested “Overview of the Continuing Education Unit and the Funding
Model” as an item. Discuss how continuing educations are structured within universities, and how
OU compares, i.e., Advanced Programs. Continuing Education programs are viewed differently,
how do we change the mindset? Twenty years ago, we had a lot of policies that allowed us to be
that agent that provided the infrastructure and funding would go back to the departments.

Belinda will send out notification of the next meeting. The meeting was adjourned.

April 12, 2013 Minutes Topics: MOOCs & Certificate programs

MOOCs, Next Steps (J. Pappas): Dr. Pappas recently attended a conference and came back with
information on MOOCs, next steps. He shared a PowerPoint presentation, previously shared with
the Executive Officers. MOOCs are exploding, many institutions are not thinking through the
process strategically. The first MOOC was introduced in July 2011. In one academic year, it
spread across higher education, i.e., Udacity, Coursera, edX. A business model does not really exist
yet and there is uncertainty on how money will be made. These are free courses, less than 8% will
make it through – unsure how it will lead to funding. MOOCs have greatly accelerated the appetite
for and pace of change. Changes that may occur include: 1) Reduce costs to students. 2) Teaching,
empowering, and supporting students to success. 3) Build skill sets to meet workplace partners. 4) Coach for individualized, self-paced mastery paths. The next big thing in higher education are
institutions with competency based models, i.e., WGU, UM, College for America (SNHU). College
for America is setting a competency based “template”. He was not sure many schools could
support that type of approach. Likely short-term trends for MOOCs are tablet apps, gamification,
learning analytics (identify student problems), course management, coaching, competency based
prior learning assessment, stackable certificates and badges.

OU Undergraduate Certificate Program (J. Pappas): OU has now created the ability to have
undergraduate certificates. The agenda item has gone to the OU Regents and we understand that it
was approved. The Faculty handbook contains the section on Undergraduate Certificates. Dr.
Pappas distributed that portion, highlighting the requirement of the new undergraduate certificate.
It indicates that 50% has to be upper division, undergraduate level must be 15 hours of credited
coursework, must be approved by the Academic Program Council and go through the regular
degree process. This addition means a lot to Outreach. We will be looking at creating certificates,
particularly in workplace education – employers like to see those certificates in specialty skill areas.
A lot of departments are looking into using certificates. An internal certificate can be obtained on the way to a degree. Even the traditional part of the university will see more certificates emerge.

**CE Council Membership:** Dr. Vargas distributed the current membership for review.

Dr. Pappas distributed the new Outreach Corporate Booklet.

The meeting was adjourned.
The Council on Faculty Awards and Honors met on Friday, January 15, 2013, and on Friday, March 1, 2013, in the Provost Conference Room, on the Health Sciences Center campus.

The following are members of the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satish Kumar (Chair)</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda H. Alfred</td>
<td>Medical Imaging &amp; Radiation Sciences</td>
<td>College of Allied Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald A. Greenfield</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Haney</td>
<td>Development Dentistry</td>
<td>College of Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather R. Ketchum</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Kinney</td>
<td>Alumnus</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lakshmivarahn</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyung-Bai Lee</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Milton</td>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine O’Neal</td>
<td>Pharmacy Clinical &amp; Administrative Sciences</td>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Raley</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>UOSA Appointee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna E. Rapf</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council had a slate of 50 nominations for the various awards. The nomination packets of the eight nominees for the David Ross Boyd Professorship were reviewed by all, the rest of nominations were equally split between two subcommittees consisting of near equal number of members of the Council.

The Council recommended to both Provosts, recipients for the following awards: David Ross Boyd Professorship, Regents’ Professorship, Regents’ Awards for Superior Teaching, for Superior Research, and for Superior Professional and University Service, Good Teaching Award, General Education Award, and the Merrick Teaching Award.

Members of the Council volunteered to write short bios on the winners, which were subsequently read at the faculty awards ceremonies held on April 18 at the Norman Campus and April 29 at the Health Sciences Center.

The Council meeting adjourned after electing Professor Joanna E. Rapf, Department of English, Norman Campus, as the 2013-2015 Chair of the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors.

We thank Mrs. Caroline Wheelbarger and Ms. Peggy Brown for coordinating all the activities of the Council that made our job a lot easier.
The information technology council undertook primary initiatives for focused on three main issues: Classroom Support, Electronic Resources, and General User Support.

Summary of the 2012-2013 meeting agendas

September 19 - We met to discuss options and develop plans for the year.

October 18 - General discussion

November 20 - Discussed Expo

December - no meeting

January 17
- Discussed agenda for spring
- Student Response Systems
- New D2L
- Multimedia storage
- Communication Gap, liaisons
- IT Expo conducted

February 21
- Discussed Student Response Systems (clicker) use. Recommend that OU generate a task force to provide a standard device for all (most) courses

March 28
- New oZONE landing page introduced
- The Book multiple advising application finished
- New D2L version to be introduced
- Banner 9 (grading) to be available this spring. Student enrollment with trial schedules due by 2014.

April 18
- Discussed faculty participation on the Ozone Change Request Committee
- It was suggested that I.T. needs to do as good a job as possible in promoting itself and its best products to the faculty
- Closed caption issues. 508 Compliance (ADA). Certain populations may be at a disadvantage if open-source videos are not captioned AND Kaltura.
- Discussion about use of portals.
- Discussed leadership groups and decision-making for new products. ITC? Faculty Senate Executive Committee?

Classroom Support
The creation of the Center for Teaching Excellence and the publication of the digital initiative have been high visibility actions that add computer technology into classroom instruction. The ITC included evaluation of supporting technologies as one of its major focuses this year.

One of the major initiatives this year has been supporting the instructional mission of the University. OU has identified a goal of revising the instructional program to better compete with on-line and for-profit programs. That has included The ITC invited Mark Morvant to join our meetings. Over the year, Mark has asked members of the ITC to help interview potential staff for the center. Many of the initiatives promoted by the CTE (videos, self-generated books, classroom support technology) are information technology driven. Part of these initiatives included captioning for video presentations and finding a location for delivering the videos.

- The University has launched a “Digital Initiative” to integrate digital resources into the instructional curriculum. Looking at options for providing video supplements to classroom presentations. The biggest problems faced in this area have been providing closed caption narratives for videos and the other is providing a location to deliver them. ADA requirements demand that the university provide and equivalent experience in the classroom for individuals who may be hearing impaired. This means that any video must have text captions that provide an equivalent communications to the audio provided. The current University policy requires that any public facing video be captioned. Videos that are behind a password wall, such as D2L, need not be captioned unless there is a member of the class that needs them. During the year, members of the ITC have attended several presentations by different vendors that propose to provide closed captions. None of them are automated and all rely on intervention by some person. The prices run to about $150 per hour for all of them. We need to continue to investigate options, but this continues to be a serious problem with video supplements.

- A second problem has been finding a place to house videos so that students can access them. While D2L would seem to be a natural place to do this, the system does not have space for the size files that go with audio and video storage and it does not have the communication capability to play the clips directly. The University supports iTunes U for those who use apple products. iTunes U works fairly well for Apple products, but not nearly as well for PC’s. It requires that all videos be converted to Mp4 and does not integrate easily with D2L. In response to this, OU asked us to help review Kaltura, a service that integrates well with D2L and reformates videos into the various formats required by the variety of devices used by students. OU has purchased this service for use starting this fall. (See Appendix Kaltura.)

- Another issue that we considered is the use of Student Response Systems (”aka “clickers”). Different faculty have used them effectively, especially in large classes. Since there is no standard system, different classes have required different devices. A student may have to purchase two or more in a year. Working with Mark and Bruce Mason, the ITC passed a resolution to request OU to create a review group to decide on a single system/device that will be the preferred device for the campus. The proposal will be considered by the faculty senate next fall. (See Appendix: Student response Systems.)

- Desire to Learn (D2L) is the University’s classroom management system. This year D2L produced a new version that has a substantially different interface. ITC provides testers to evaluate the difficulty for faculty adapting to the new format. The upgrade was installed May 25.
Electronic Resources.

The University uses a combination of Luminis and Banner, both products of Ellucian, as the engines to support oZONE. oZONE is the University student information system that supports classroom and financial functions for students and faculty. This product provides the student, faculty and staff access to the academic functions of the University. While this product has good functionality, its usability and user friendliness is weak. Last year the ITC added a faculty member to the Ozone Change Review Committee (OCRC). This has allowed us to push for interface changes to improve the interface to make changes to the interface and improvements to functionality that matter to faculty. Two years ago the Faculty Senate requested a number of changes to the system. The first of these changes was installed this spring.

Another issue has been the awkward interface into the oZONE system. We (ITC) created a User Experience committee within the OCRC to improve this interface. This will produce a major revision to be rolled out this July. (See Appendix oZONE.)

General User Requests

Two years ago the faculty senate submitted several requests for modifications to systems that supported student welfare, primarily through advising. These requests dealt primarily with changes to “The Book”, a custom developed interface into the Banner student records system. The two most critical requests were implemented this year. These will materially improve the ability of faculty and advisors to help students. (See Appendix: Faculty Senate Requests.)

General:
- OU IT contracted with Microsoft for free MS Office Professional
- Attended D2L video capture presentation
- Added Mark Morvant to the IPC. Now have an active student member.
- Member of the Ozone Change Review Committee and the Ozone User Experience subcommittee
- Attended Fall textbook alternative presentation by Mark Morvant in Fall
  - Tuition and fees: $8705
  - Books: $1200
  - Reviewed user assembled options and open textbook alternatives.
- Attended review sessions for alternative storage and delivery mechanism for multimedia by Kaltura
- Attended open textbook presentations by Mark Morvant and by the Open Stax organization.
- Attended recruiting presentation for William Farrell as member of the Center For Teaching Excellence (Mark Morvant's center) as a ADA expert. Also attended the presentation from Dr. Felix Wao, candidate for Director of Assessment for Learning.
- Participated in user test for new D2L interface

Appendix: Student Response Systems

Student Response Systems Resolution:

Resolution to Request the University of Oklahoma Administration to form a task force to determine a recommended and supported Student Response System (aka “Clicker”) for campus instructional use.
Student Response Systems (SRS) are coming into common use, particularly in large classes, as instructors attempt to get more interactivity into the classroom experience. Students pay the overall cost of acquiring these devices in the same way that they acquire other course resources. Since several different devices are in use on the campus, this sometimes means that a student must acquire several different devices. It also means that Information Technology classroom support is divided among the different devices.

A better solution would be to settle on a preferred device and an easy way for students to acquire that device so that the student and university can focus their resources. As with all technology, the SRS technology is evolving rapidly. It is not suggested that this selection indicate a permanent commitment. The primary use of the devices is for large introductory courses, which are usually taken in the first two years of a student’s career. Periodic review of the recommendation would be appropriate.

The task force should be empowered to make a university wide recommendation about technology and acquisition process. It should include representatives from Information Technology, University administration, and classroom instructors.

Update:

Greetings all,

A quick update on what is happening with the review of clicker systems on campus.

I have received 7 responses from faculty to the survey sent around at the end of last semester, and will get together a summary of the responses this evening or tomorrow.

I have gotten back responses from the vendors that I sent requests. I'll have these posted and available shortly as well. I'll also work on a summary of these, although that's going to be a bit more difficult because of the variation in responses.

Turning is going to work with a couple of experienced faculty members next semester on using their clickers. This will give us some direct comparisons between systems.

A couple of vendors are interested or planning to be on campus this summer to do presentation on these systems. I hope some of you will be able to join these. One vendor is going to be in Oklahoma in a couple of weeks. I'll send out information about this in the next message.

Hope your summers have started well.

Best,
Bruce

*****************************************************************************
Bruce Mason, Assoc. Prof.
Homer L. Dodge Dept. of Physics & Astronomy University of Oklahoma

Appendix Faculty Senate Requests

Holds:

ANNOUNCEMENT

UPGRADE of “HOLDS” is now in the “BOOK”
We are pleased to announce that the “HOLDS” component of the upgrades designed to improve the functionality and usability of the “Book” for faculty, staff and administrators has been deployed into production. The changes are significant in scope and application, but we feel confident that the new design and screen interaction are intuitive enough that training sessions and or new sets of instructions to current users is NOT needed. We do, however, want to advise you on some of the new benefits and operating conditions of the “HOLDS” process in order to assist you in making the transition from sending this information to Enrollment Services to using the new screens.

1) Colleges will identify those authorized to update student records from this tab on the Big Page in the “Book” for “Holds”, individuals with current authority to remove advising flags may also now use this tab as well without additional authorization.

2) Access of this tab requires the normal process of loading a student to the “Book”, then selecting the “Big Page” and then the “Holds” tab. You can release or set new holds based on your authorities although you can view all student “Holds”. Releasing a hold is immediate. Placing a hold is immediate by default, but may be altered to a future date to become active. This typically happens when you want to lift a hold so a student may enroll or add/drop.

3) Advising “Holds” is simply an On/Off setting by term.

If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact Debbie Blevins at 325-1084.

Overrides:

ANNOUNCEMENT

UPGRADE of “HOLDS” is now in the “BOOK”

We are pleased to announce that the “HOLDS” component of the upgrades designed to improve the functionality and usability of the “Book” for faculty, staff and administrators has been deployed into production. The changes are significant in scope and application, but we feel confident that the new design and screen interaction are intuitive enough that training sessions and or new sets of instructions to current users is NOT needed. We do, however, want to advise you on some of the new benefits and operating conditions of the “HOLDS” process in order to assist you in making the transition from sending this information to Enrollment Services to using the new screens.

1) Colleges will identify those authorized to update student records from this tab on the Big Page in the “Book” for “Holds”, individuals with current authority to remove advising flags may also now use this tab as well without additional authorization.

2) Access of this tab requires the normal process of loading a student to the “Book”, then selecting the “Big Page” and then the “Holds” tab. You can release or set new holds based on your authorities although you can view all student “Holds”. Releasing a hold is immediate. Placing a hold is immediate by default, but may be altered to a future date to become active. This typically happens when you want to lift a hold so a student may enroll or add/drop.

3) Advising “Holds” is simply an On/Off setting by term.

If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact Debbie Blevins at 325-1084.
Appendix: oZONE:
Appendix: Kaltura

Good news! Nick Hathaway approved our recommendation of Kaltura and noted the due diligence conducted in evaluating this solution.

Thank you for your time and efforts in helping to make this happen and making this possible for our academic community!

We’ll be sure to keep you informed of upcoming planning sessions to prepare for the rollout of this new service.

Loretta

From: Wade Howard  
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2013 11:55 AM  
Subject: Kaltura Welcomes The University of Oklahoma

Good morning,

It is with great pleasure I am writing to introduce the newest member of the Kaltura family, The University of Oklahoma. They will be utilizing Kaltura's Cross Campus Suite with Kaltura MediaSpace and Desire2Learn Video Extension for managing media for their students and faculty. Copied on this email is JEB Sheriff, who is our primary point of contact and their Learning Spaces Analyst. His contact info is listed below so please reach out directly to him when we have assigned a project manager and are ready to coordinate introductions. JEB would like to have the kickoff as soon as possible.

Of special note is the proximity of The University of Oklahoma to the community of Moore, OK, that was devastated by a tornado this week. The campus is 5 minutes away. The entire campus has been involved with supporting their neighbors, however, the team evaluating and procuring Kaltura continued their contract evaluation and approvals this week. G Gooder and I worked with this team and from our first conversation, to a very well coordinated and productive campus meeting, and all the way to this morning's contract approval and check in call with them, they have been the greatest group of professionals. Our hearts and thoughts are with them as they continue to support and rebuild their community.

Contact:  
J.E.B. Sheriff  
LEARNING SPACES ANALYST  
OU Information Technology

Thank you and look forward to joining you on the kickoff call!

Sincerely,

Wade Howard  
Sales Executive – Education  
Kaltura Inc
Membership
The members of the 2012-2013 Research Council, their departments and terms:

Paul Spicer  Anthropology  2010-13
Judith Lewis  History  2010-13
Marvin Lamb  Music  2010-13
Michael McInerney  Microbiology/Plant Biology  2010-13
Lori Snyder  Psychology  2010-13
Dimitrios Papavassiliou  Chemical, Biological & Materials Eng.  2011-14
Suzanne Moon  History of Science  2011-14
Robert Cichewicz  Chemistry/Biochemistry  2011-14
Laurie Scrivener  University Libraries  2011-14
Younane Abousleiman  Geology/Geophysics  2012-15
Traci Carte  Management Information Systems  2012-15
Sheena Murphy  Physics/Astronomy  2012-15
Bing Zhang  Biology  2012-15

Ex-Officio Members:
Kelvin Droegemeier  Vice President for Research
Alicia Knoedler  Associate Vice President for Research, and Director of the Center for Research Program Development & Enrichment

Secretary:
Cindy Clark  Center for Research Program Development & Enrichment

Professor Judith Lewis joined the Council in January 2013 to complete the term for Marcia Haag, and Professor Robert Cichewicz joined the Council in November 2012 to complete the term for Ralf Schmidt.

Professors Spicer, Lewis, Lamb, McInerney and Snyder completed their terms at the end of the 2012-2013 academic year. The 2013-2014 Chair of the Research Council was elected at the April, 2013 meeting and will be Dr. Sheena Murphy, Department of Physics and Astronomy.

The Faculty Senate Appointments to replace Paul Spicer, Judith Lewis and Marvin Lamb, and the Presidential Appointments to replace Michael McInerney and Lori Snyder will be forthcoming.

In accordance to the charge of the Research Council (January 7, 2004), appointments to the Council include two members in each of the following six areas and one member from Fine Arts:

a) Engineering: Younane Abousleiman and Dimitrios Papavassiliou
b) Physical Sciences: Robert Cichewicz and Sheena Murphy
c) Social Sciences and Education: Paul Spicer and Lori Snyder
d) Biological Sciences: Michael McInerney and Bing Zhang
e) Humanities and Arts: Judith Lewis and Suzanne Moon
f) Other: Laurie Scrivener and Traci Carte
g) Fine Arts: Marvin Lamb
Activities (2012-2013)
The primary activity of the Research Council during the 2012-2013 academic year was to advise and make recommendations to the Vice President for Research (VPR) pertaining to awards and honors under his administration, namely:

- Faculty Investment Program (Up to $15,000)
- Junior Faculty Fellowships ($7,000 + Fringe)
- VPR Awards Program (4 awards of $2,500 each)
- George Lynn Cross Research Professorship (recommendation to President)
- Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research

A summary of the Research Council funding and award recommendations approved by the VPR for the period July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013 is available on the Research Council’s website. Statistics concerning the programs supported by the Research Council as of May 31, 2013 are attached.

The Research Council devoted much time and discussion to funding programs, award nominations and additional issues.

- Faculty Investment Program (FIP) – Last year, the Research Council folded the Small Grant program, the Large Grant Program and the Faculty Investment Program (FIP) $3,000 and Under into the Faculty Investment Program (FIP). The Faculty Investment Program provides funding on a competitive basis to develop and expand the scholarly (i.e., research and creative) activities of Norman campus researchers, including researchers associated with Norman Campus Programs at OU-Tulsa. The FIP is designed to provide maximum flexibility in meeting researcher needs via strategic investment of funds with a high degree of expectation and accountability. Ultimately, FIP is expected to enhance the national and international reputation of the University of Oklahoma via excellence in scholarship. The goal of obtaining external funding is not a requirement, but proposals are carefully evaluated for the contribution they make to a faculty member’s program of research, scholarship, or creative activity. The maximum award under the FIP is $15,000, and proposals are welcome in any amount up to the maximum. During fiscal year 2013, there were 62 FIP requests submitted to the Research Council, and 30 awards were funded for a total of $301,738. One award of $14,994 was declined because the faculty received an internal funding award from another program for the same project.

Junior Faculty Fellowship Program – This program is designed to help new tenure-track faculty members establish their research/creative activity and make progress toward tenure by providing support in areas critical to the development of their programs. The program is restricted to tenure-track assistant professors who are in the first four years of their tenure-track position at the University. As a general rule, the $7,000 (plus fringe benefits) awards are used as summer (June and July) stipends to enable faculty members to carry out full time research during that period. However, the awards are not limited to summer stipends, and faculty members are urged to use the awards in a manner that provides maximum benefit to their research programs. This might include supplies, equipment, personnel, and travel. A faculty member receiving an award is expected to make a one-month commitment to research during the summer. Faculty members who have not acquired a terminal degree by the deadline for application, associate and full professors, instructors, and visiting appointees are not eligible for this program. Also, because of the limited number of available awards, faculty cannot receive an award in consecutive years, and faculty who have other sources of summer salary support receive lower priority. In February 2013, 17 proposals were selected from 52 submissions to receive Junior Faculty Fellowships. Most requested the funds to be used for salary; however, there were a few faculty that submitted budgets that included supplies, resulting in differing award amounts. The amounts ranged from $4,146 to $9,632 and the total funding amount for the program was $151,188.
• In addition to those internal funding programs administered through the Research Council, the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) provides additional funding opportunities for faculty through the Faculty Travel Assistance Program (FTAP), a matching funds program that allows faculty to request funds for travel to actively participate in conferences, to meet with collaborators and program officers, and to conduct research or collect data. The OVPR also supports faculty in their efforts to publish their research by providing funds through the Publication Support Program (PSP), another matching funds program that covers required costs associated with publishing.

• During this fiscal year, the Office of the Vice President for Research also created a new program specifically for projects based in Arts and Humanities. The Arts and Humanities Faculty Fellowship (AHFF) provides faculty the opportunity to focus on a scholarly and/or creative activity that significantly transforms the faculty member’s research program and makes notable contributions to the field. Current data regarding this program will be posted on the VPR website.

• The Council reviewed nominations and made recommendations to the Provost for the George Lynn Cross Research Professorship and the Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Educational Research. They also made recommendations to the VPR for the VPR Outstanding Research Impact Award and the VPR Outstanding Research Engagement Award.

• The Research Council’s website now lists award information for all of the Research Council grant and award recipients.

• During the 2014 fiscal year, the Research Council will be reviewing and revising the guidelines for the Henry Daniel Rinsland Memorial Award for Excellence in Education Research to clarify the nomination and selection criteria.

• During the summer of 2013, the Research Council will also be revising the FIP guidelines to clarify various parts of the proposal process. In an effort to better track and make the FIP proposal submission process more efficient, the Center for Research Program Development and Enrichment will develop an online submission process for proposals.

• The Research Council will also be working with the Faculty Senate in Fall 2013 to re-balance the Research Council membership to more accurately reflect the disciplines represented by recent patterns among submitted proposals.

On behalf of the Research Council, the Chair would like to thank Vice President for Research, Dr. Kelvin Droegemeier, for his enthusiasm, energetic leadership, and unique vision in reshaping the research landscape at the University of Oklahoma. The Research Council also thanks Dr. Alicia Knoedler, Associate Vice President for Research and Director of the Center for Research Program Development & Enrichment, for her efforts on behalf of the Council and for her support of the OU faculty in their efforts to produce quality research and creative activity. At the May meeting, the Vice President for Research presented the outgoing members (Paul Spicer, Judith Lewis, Marvin Lamb, Michael McInerney, and Lori Snyder), Dimitrios Papavassiliou (served 2011-2013), Suzanne Moon (served 2011-2013), Laurie Scrivener (served 2011-2013), Bing Zhang (served 2012-2013), Ralf Schmidt (served 2011-2012), and Marcia Haag (served 2010-2012) with clocks to show their appreciation for the members’ service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$10,363</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences and Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$8,793</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$13,032</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$7,808</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,033</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,904</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Number of Proposals Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Average Award</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Program Expenditures</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Number Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9,632</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences and Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$9,263</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,128</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$9,340</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,573</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,632</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 2012-Spring 2013 committee members:
Nancy LaGreca, Chair
Lily Huang
Amy Bradshaw
Lawrence Baines
Alberto Striolo

Fall 2012-Spring 2013 Meeting dates:
September 17, 2012
October 25, 2012
November 16, 2012 (Prof. LaGreca met with Susannah Livingood and Cheryl Jorgenson in
Institutional Research (IR))
November 26, 2012
December 3, 2012
February 26, 2013
March 12, 2013
April 14-15 (schedule conflicts; discussed business via email)
May 9-16, 2013 (schedule conflicts; discussed business via email)

Fall business:
In fall 2012, Faculty Senate Chair Michael Bemben charged the committee with following
up on previous 2011-12 FCC Chair Kanthasamy Muraleetharan’s study, which indicated the
efficiency of administrative costs per college vis-à-vis the number of faculty members each college
manages. Before presenting this report to President Boren, it was determined that further study was
necessary to show how the OU efficiency ratios compared to similar efficiency ratios at peer
institutions. However, because deans’ salaries at specific institutions were not available, the FCC
could not create the ratios.

After pursuing a number of different approaches with the support of Susannah Livingood
and Cheryl Jorgenson of the Office of Institutional Research and Reporting, Prof. LaGreca reported
back to Prof. Bemben that the information required was not available to create a report in a timely
fashion, as the FCC would have to request the budget books of each peer institution and recreate the
ratios by hand. The FCC determined that, given the gravity of faculty salary compression and
inversion, the committee’s time would be best spent focusing in this issue. Prof. Bemben approved
this change in focus.

Spring business:
On April 16, 2013, the FCC submitted its Report on Compression and Inversion to
President Boren, Provost Mergler, Vice President for Financial Affairs Nick Hathaway, and Faculty
Senate Chair Michael Bemben. A summary of the report follows and is also available on the
Faculty Senate website.

In May 2013, Prof. LaGreca’s term as FCC Chair ended and the committee supported the
nomination of Prof. Baines to serve as FCC Chair for 2013-14.
Rationale for the study

The absence of university-wide merit raise programs since FY 2007 has caused problems of salary compression and inversion [C&I] for faculty at the ranks of associate and full professor. Faculty Senate Chair Mike Bemben, following up on President Boren’s acknowledgment of the problem, charged the FCC with carrying out a study of compression and inversion on the OU Norman campus.¹

Objective

The purpose of this study is to present information on current salary C&I.

Definitions and Calculation of C&I

The FCC focused on compression and inversion by rank and within departments or academic units. Faculty whose salaries are within $5000 or a 7% increase (a promotion raise) of the highest earning faculty member in the rank below were considered to be compressed.² Faculty who earn a lower salary than the highest earning person in the rank below were considered to be inverted.³

¹ Journal of the Faculty Senate September 12, 2012
² A promotion raise was determined to be the higher of $5000 or approximately 7% of salary.
³ The method used in the formula on the spreadsheet is the following: Within each department, we identified the highest salary in the lower rank (for comparison 1 this was an assistant professor salary; for comparison 2 it was an associate professor salary). To identify compressed faculty we calculated adjusted salaries for members of the next rank up to account for the promotion raise as follows: for salaries $0-71,999, salary minus $5000; for salaries $72,000-$94,999, salary minus $6000; for salaries $95,000-110,999, salary minus $7000; for salaries $111,000 and over, salary minus $8000. To identify inverted faculty we identified faculty earning less than the highest salary in the lower rank.
Observations and study overview

On the OU Norman campus:

- 59.8% of Associate Professors are compressed
- 34.0% of Associate Professors are inverted
- 42.6% of Professors are compressed
- 32.5% of Professors are inverted

The problem of compression and inversion [C&I] is more severe in some colleges than in others, as explicated by the chart on pages 2-3. Costs to address the problem have been included.

Recommendation:
Consider prioritizing C&I based upon 1) merit and 2) length of time at rank, rather than providing a uniform across-the-board increase for faculty.

The FCC does not recommend across-the-board compression raises. Some dedicated and productive faculty members earn salaries comparable to (or less than) newly hired Assistant Professors. The FCC recommends prioritizing deserving C&I faculty, including scaling appropriately relative to time at rank.

Further, the FCC requests that correcting C&I be taken into consideration for long-term financial planning.
## Compressed and Inverted Faculty
### University of Oklahoma Spring 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Compressed/Inverted Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors Considered</strong></td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors Compressed</strong></td>
<td>213  60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professors Compressed and Inverted</strong></td>
<td>121  34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors Considered</strong></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors Compressed</strong></td>
<td>164  43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professors Compressed and Inverted</strong></td>
<td>125  32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compressed</strong></td>
<td>377  51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Compressed and Inverted</strong></td>
<td>246  33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty Considered</th>
<th>Faculty Compressed</th>
<th>Long-Term Goal: Estimate to Address Compression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Academic Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmos &amp; Geographic Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Energy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Direct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Faculty Considered</th>
<th>C/C&amp;I Faculty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Long Term Goal: Estimate to Address Compression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Science Div</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$528.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design Div</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$2,888.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Division</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$53,199.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional &amp; City Planning Div</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$44,969.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Arch Div</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$13,883.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch-Tulsa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,469.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arts and Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Faculty Considered</th>
<th>C/C&amp;I Faculty</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Long Term Goal: Estimate to Address Compression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African &amp; Afro-American Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$183.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$3,630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>$337,676.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations - Tulsa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>$13,683.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$660,311.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Information Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$29,485.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Lang/Lit/Ling</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>$193,996.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$81,502.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$171,739.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$86,589.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Exercise Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$14,319.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$265,088.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$241,646.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$13,849.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>$41,904.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology and Plant Biology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$173,613.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$35,564.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$189,573.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Biological Survey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$81,390.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$129,781.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$72,438.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$3,049.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$10,423.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$3,407.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$1,253.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology - Tulsa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Info Studies Tulsa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work - Tulsa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>346</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,856,102.93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Total Faculty Considered</td>
<td>C/C&amp;I Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Long Term Goal: Estimate to Address Compression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atmospheric &amp; Geographic Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$91,953.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$207,501.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>$299,454.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Intl Area Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$410,499.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$410,499.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$370,898.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engr. &amp; Environmental Sci.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$277,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical, Bio. &amp; Mat. Engr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$65,020.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace &amp; Mech. Engr.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$37,303.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE TCOM - TULSA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$20,409.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$31,322.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Systems Engr.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$4,008.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>$806,468.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism &amp; Mass Communications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$148,094.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$148,094.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Academic Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost AC Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$22,478.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$22,478.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Law Instruction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Total Faculty Considered</td>
<td>C/C&amp;I Faculty</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Long Term Goal: Estimate to Address Compression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$34,110.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$34,110.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology &amp; Geophysics OUF Crg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$38,287.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum &amp; Geological Engr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$61,187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology &amp; Geophysics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$69,479.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$168,953.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin Instruction</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$837,670.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$837,670.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$2,763.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$2,763.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$20,916.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst Leadership &amp; AC Cur</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$17,376.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ Leadership &amp; Policy Std</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$61,423.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elps Operations - Tulsa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$50,748.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilac Operations - Tulsa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$150,466.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$1,685.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$1,685.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>$191,396.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$819,772.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$9,281.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$3,015.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Theater</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$1,023,465.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Membership
The members of the 2012-2013 Faculty Welfare Committee, their departments and terms:

- Misha Klein  
  Anthropology, 2012-2015 (co-chair Fall 2012, chair Spring 2013)
- Greg Burge  
  Economics, Fall 2012 (co-chair Fall 2012)
- Al Schwarzkopf  
  Management Information Systems, 2010-2013
- Deborah Trytten  
  Computer Science, 2010-2013
- Jerry Weber  
  Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, 2011-2014
- Donna Nelson  
  Chemistry & Biochemistry, Spring 2013-2014 (completing Burge term)

II. Meetings
The Faculty Welfare Committee met four times in the Fall 2012 semester and three times in the Spring 2013 semester (including a meeting with the Provost, detailed below), as well as electronically exchanging documents under development throughout the year.

III. Issues
At the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic year, the Faculty Welfare Committee identified a number of prior issues to be pursued as well as new issues for our agenda. Ultimately, the following issues became our priorities and the primary foci of our efforts over the course of the year:

1. The promotion of faculty health & wellness through the development or improvement of or access to:
   a. walking paths
   b. exercise facilities
   c. promotion of bicycle commuting
2. The development of a campus-wide family leave policy

IV. Actions
A. The first issue on which we acted was a resolution to promote walking and biking to campus by making available one-time use parking permits. The following resolution was submitted to the Faculty Senate:
TOPI:  TEMPORARY PARKING PERMITS

SUBMITTED BY: FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE, 2012-13

DATE: October 15, 2012

WHEREAS, There continues to be a shortage of parking on campus; and

WHEREAS, Vehicle congestion poses transportation, safety, and health problems for the campus community; and

WHEREAS, The University wishes to encourage healthy behaviors on the part of faculty, staff, and students; and

WHEREAS, Bicycling, walking, and other self-propelled modes of transportation to campus relieves the pressures on parking and traffic, while engaging in aerobic exercise; and

WHEREAS, Many faculty and staff live in the vicinity of campus; and

WHEREAS, There are very few days out of every year on which it is unsafe or impossible to bicycle or walk, making a year-round parking permit unnecessary; and

WHEREAS, Faculty and staff occasionally have need for a car on campus in order to conduct University business (i.e., transporting job candidates and other visiting scholars); and

WHEREAS, Faculty and staff from the Tulsa and HSC campuses occasionally need to come to the Norman campus; and

WHEREAS, Faculty and staff with spouses on campus are not always able to coordinate schedules to avoid bringing two cars; it is

RESOLVED, That the Parking Office shall make available to faculty and staff single-use, one-day parking permits, available for purchase individually or up to ten at a time in advance, to encourage alternate modes of transportation for the benefit of individual wellbeing and that of the campus community, while providing flexibility; and be it

RESOLVED, The Parking Office shall set the price of such temporary permits so that they will not be used as a cheaper alternative to purchasing a year-round pass or be substituted for daily visitor passes.

The Resolution was discussed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and discussed at the November meeting of the Faculty Senate, and then voted on and passed by the Faculty Senate at the December meeting. Simultaneously, the suggestion was taken up by Parking Services and implemented. As of January 2013, single-day parking permits are available for purchase at the Parking Office for $3 each, individually or in multiples. Faculty/Staff permits may be used in designated Faculty/Staff parking lots, while Student permits may be used in student lots. They have been priced so that they are not a less-expensive alternative to the purchase of an annual pass. Faculty/Staff permits may not be purchased online because the University has not (yet) made arrangements for pre-tax deductions.
B. The second issue that we addressed was the drafting of a proposal for a campus-wide family leave policy. Drawing on existing policies in two departments on campus (Health and Exercise Sciences & Modern Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics), examples of family leave policies implemented at other universities, documents compiled by the College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Advisory Committee on Women’s Issues (including the current state of such policies within the CAS), and scholarly articles about the effects of the lack of such policies, or inadequate policies, on academic work-life balance, the FWC drafted a proposed policy. In drafting the policy, we followed a set of ranked goals that emerged during our discussions:

a. Given that no University Policy currently exists, and that considerable differences in treatment have been experienced by faculty with similar family driven needs, our top priority was to create a University-wide policy covering all but the most uncommon instances of Family leave.

b. To ensure all faculty members have the opportunity to benefit from increased attention to fairness across campus in terms of work/family balance issues, we resolved to address both parental leave situations and cases where a faculty member is the primary caregiver for a sick/injured/recovering dependent family member.

c. The policy should reduce the teaching duties of an affected faculty member in the term following the qualifying event. Encouragement to continue research and activities related to graduate student advising should accompany the description of reduced teaching responsibilities. Our proposal uses the wording “modified teaching duties” with the understanding that departments still carry a reasonable degree of flexibility in determining the specific nature of this reduction. All courses released under the policy would not be made up during subsequent semesters.

d. The policy should respect the particular vulnerability of junior faculty affected by either situation, as they are within their probationary period and carry the responsibility of producing clear evidence of excellence in the areas of research and teaching during a condensed period of time. As such, a one-year extension of the tenure clock was envisioned as the default when the policy is utilized, with an easy opt-out for any faculty member wishing to forgo the extension and be considered for tenure/promotion at the end of their original probationary period. The current University limitation of no more than two years of extended time on a probationary window would remain unaffected.

e. The wording of the policy should be gender-neutral, recognizing that male or female faculty may experience situations where they would be the primary caregiver for a dependent child, parent, or other family member. Whether a faculty member is or is not a “primary caregiver” would be determined by the faculty member, who obviously carries the best information regarding their situation. However, faculty members should apply typical professional and ethical judgment when deciding to use the policy. In cases where two faculty members are affected by the same event, they should jointly determine who will receive the “primary” designation and associated reduction in teaching responsibilities.

f. Again, in specific regards to junior faculty – but also extending to tenured faculty members - the policy should encourage other faculty evaluating performance to respect the following ideas:
I. Annual Teaching Evaluations should not suffer simply because a faculty member had modified teaching responsibilities during the year in question.

II. It should be acknowledged that junior faculty using this policy would still teach as many courses during their probationary period as other cases, providing the same opportunity to gather evidence of effective performance in the classroom.

III. Even with modified teaching duties during the semester following/concurrent with the family leave related event, there are still considerable difficulties carrying out research. However, the goal of this policy is to create as level a playing field as possible for all candidates for tenure, regardless of their family situation. As such, faculty using the policy should be expected to have no more, as well as no less, tangible research productivity by the end of their probationary period than faculty who did not.

The policy was modified through input from both the Faculty Welfare Committee and from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The final draft bears the title “Family Fairness Policy” in order to make clear that the proposal is not for a “leave” (though this is the language used nationally for such policies), but instead describes modified duties, allowing a faculty member to focus for a short period on the intensive care of a child or other family member, without a disruption to her or his classroom or committee responsibilities. Faculty responsibilities to students and to research extend far beyond the classroom and the particular time-frame of the semester, and these do not stop, so faculty are not able to take a full leave of responsibilities. Additionally, the revised title is meant to emphasize that the structure of the 16-week semester does not correspond to the 12-week time frame of the national FMLA. Finally, the emphasis on “fairness” is intended to draw attention to the fact that a lack of such a policy creates multiple situations of inequality directly related to the academic career path, while the uneven application of similar policies and practices across campus sets up other forms of inequalities among faculty working in different colleges and different departments. As such, while attempting to preserve some measure of flexibility according to departmental needs, it is hoped that the following policy, if not adopted for the entire University, can stand as a model for departments to implement clear and just policies that promote a healthy work-life balance and create a supportive and collegial atmosphere.
In considering the needs of faculty members and the University community, the University recognizes that faculty members may face situations in which their family obligations limit their ability to maintain all of their varied obligations and duties in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The work demands on faculty members involve duties outside of the academic calendar, alongside the obligations incurred during the 16-week semester. In the interest of attracting the best candidates to join our University community, and in order to retain and care for faculty who represent a major investment of the University’s resources, the University seeks to create a cooperative work environment, supporting not only faculty research endeavors but also the achievement of a sustainable and healthy work-life balance. Further, the University recognizes that major life events, such as the birth or adoption of a child, or the need for intensive care of another family member, do not necessarily conform to the academic calendar.

Therefore, in order to enable faculty to meet their ongoing research and service demands, and avoid disruption to students during the semester, we recommend that The University of Oklahoma Norman Campus formally adopt the following policy, which operates within the spirit of existing University of Oklahoma policies, including OU’s Family and Medical Leave Policy. If, for any reason, an individual academic unit is unable to conform to this policy, they must draft an alternate policy that details the accommodations to be granted faculty under circumstances that require such consideration such as those specified below.

This policy provides for the automatic extension of the tenure clock for tenure-track faculty, and allows for one semester of modified teaching and relief from very demanding service duties if a tenure-track, tenured, or renewable term faculty member is a primary caregiver: (1) following the birth or adoption of a child; or (2) for an individual who has a serious health condition (as defined by OU policy).

A tenure-track faculty member who is a primary caregiver of a newborn or newly adopted child or a seriously ill family member will qualify for a one-year extension of the probationary period, unless s/he requests a waiver of the extension. This extension may be waived by eligible faculty members, if s/he so requests, before s/he goes up for tenure. Furthermore, if after consultation with her/his department chair and Committee A the faculty member wishes to go up for tenure at the time when s/he would have done so without the previously granted extension of the probationary period, it would not be considered an “early tenure” process. There is a maximum possible extension of two years due to multiple births, adoptions, or caretaking situations. The request to activate the extension of the probationary period must be made within 12 months of the qualifying event. The request must be submitted to the department chair and Committee A, who will forward the request along with a letter confirming the faculty member’s eligibility to the Dean, who will in turn forward the request to the Provost. It should be noted that any tenure-track faculty member – including those who are expecting the birth of a child or are adopting a child but are not the designated primary caregiver, as well as those experiencing hardship not related to this leave policy - can apply to extend her/his probationary period at any time.
In the event of these major family events, tenure-track, tenured, or renewable term faculty members may request modified duties. Faculty on modified-duties status will be relieved of direct teaching responsibilities and very demanding service requirements (e.g., Committee A), but will be expected to fulfill their other professional responsibilities (e.g., other departmental committee assignments, preparation of course materials, research and preparation of research proposals and publications, and supervision of graduate students). The faculty member will not be expected to make up the modified duties in a subsequent semester. Faculty will not be permitted to teach overload courses during the period of modified duties. The teaching component of the annual evaluation will make allowances for the period of modified duties. The annual evaluation rating and associated salary increases shall not be negatively affected by the period of absence. The maximum period for which modified duties will be assigned is one semester (i.e., Spring or Fall) per academic year. In the event of a birth or adoption of a child, the semester of modified duties should be completed within 12 months following the birth or adoption.

Faculty members requesting modified duties for one semester must inform the department chair as early as possible to allow time to process the request, identify, and secure alternative teaching staff, if necessary. For requests related to birth or adoption, modified duties should be made no later than three months after the event. All requests for modified duties should be submitted in writing to the department Chair, who together with Committee A, will evaluate the request and write a letter detailing how the accommodation would be made within the department, which will be forwarded along with the request to the Dean. After approval by the Dean, copies of the approval shall be sent to the faculty member and the department chair.

The above policy was approved by both the Faculty Welfare and the Faculty Senate Executive Committees. We have had several discussions with the Provost about the proposed policy and she has asked that we refrain from bringing it before the full Faculty Senate until she has had a chance to work with Legal Counsel and present a version that can be supported by the Administration. In order to advance this process, the FWC, along with members of the FSEC met with Provost Mergler on April 1, 2013, to discuss the goals and language of the proposal. In attendance were:

- Provost Nancy Mergler
- Greg Heiser – Legal Counsel
- Misha Klein - Faculty Welfare Committee (Chair)
- Greg Burge - Faculty Welfare Committee (co-Chair, Fall 2012)
- Jerry Weber - Faculty Welfare Committee member
- Al Schwarzkopf - Faculty Welfare Committee member
- Deborah Trytten - Faculty Welfare Committee member
- Donna Nelson - Faculty Welfare Committee member (as of Spring 2013)
- Mike Bemben - Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Chair)
- Ed O’Rear - Faculty Senate Executive Committee (in-coming Chair)
- Andy Fagg - Faculty Senate Executive Committee member
- Laura Palk - University Institutional Equity/Title IX/Office for Equal Opportunity

The following issues were discussed at the meeting:

- The federal FMLA policy does not conform to the 16-week semester schedule at OU, causing disruptions because of changes in teaching personnel
The proposed policy is for modified duties, not a full leave, because faculty cannot take a leave from their research endeavors

Release from teaching and major service would allow faculty under the circumstances described in the document to focus their scholarly efforts on research

OU supports faculty research in the form of grants, and this policy can be considered part of this larger effort

The policy would help to create a supportive campus environment that recognizes faculty family responsibilities alongside their scholarly ones

The policy would help to attract highly qualified candidates and maintain faculty in whom the University has invested valuable resources

The policy would be an important step towards gender equity, in recognition of the disproportionate burden of family care that falls on female faculty in general, while keeping the policy gender neutral in recognition of the social changes of the current generation

Universities across the country are adopting similar policies, especially given recent research showing the loss of female researchers/faculty, especially in the STEM fields

Because of the time involved in achieving a doctorate, and the common delay in childbearing among scholars, these circumstances weigh most heavily on junior faculty, who are also the most vulnerable (politically, professionally, and financially)

The lack of a campus-wide policy, and the inconsistency in accommodations made across campus, is unfair, creates an atmosphere of distrust, and may leave the University vulnerable to legal action

Provost Mergler was generally supportive of the issues, and concerned with the inequities across campus, as exemplified in the anecdotes about junior female faculty member about to give birth being advised by senior faculty not to take an extension because it would look like she was not serious about her career, and another about a faculty member obliged to make up a course from a previous semester that did not make during the semester she was due to give birth, thus compounding the problems for students, and disrupting three course, rather than two (or fewer). Provost Mergler also expressed concern about the burden that an across-the-board modified-duties (teaching release) policy would place on smaller units. There remain pragmatic issues to be addressed, and Misha Klein (FWC chair) and Ed O’Rear (Faculty Senate chair) will be discussing these with the Provost over the summer. It is our hope that we will be able to present a policy to the Faculty Senate at the beginning of the next academic year.

C. The third and final substantive issue addressed by the Faculty Welfare Committee this year is a perennial concern: the promotion of faculty wellness and healthy practices for faculty, and the state and availability of facilities. The concerns can be grouped into the following issues:
1. the deplorable condition of the Houston-Huffman (men’s) locker room
2. the lack of a separate facility for faculty
3. the inadequate publicity for alternative facilities that may be accessed by faculty
4. the need for the planned walking path on campus

Construction is about to begin on the Scholar’s Walk walking path during the summer of 2013, along with other modifications on campus that will facilitate bicycle use. The latter is being addressed by a separate committee specifically dedicated to promoting bicycling and bicycle safety on and in the vicinity of campus. Other changes are being made to existing facilities. However, the lack of a separate facility for faculty remains a problem. Many members of the faculty, especially women, do not feel comfortable using the same exercise facilities as students, so the lack of a separate facility discourages faculty
exercise, in spite of reduced cost. The health insurance company contracted by OU, Blue Cross Blue Shield, has a program that for $25/month allows members access to any of their contracted facilities (some 7000 across the country, which is particularly interesting for faculty who must travel for research but do not want to lose their exercise regime). However, the facilities in Norman are few, and there are no facilities on the east side of town. We have asked Breion Rollins to approach BCBS about extending the program to a few other facilities in Norman to provide greater regional coverage. We have also asked Breion Rollins to work on further publicizing the program to encourage faculty participation, as very few members of the faculty appear to be aware of this benefit.

It must be noted that this is an inadequate alternative to the availability of a separate faculty facility on campus. Faculty exercise must be encouraged and promoted in every way possible, for the wellbeing of the individuals, and for the financial wellbeing of the University, as there is a direct and demonstrable relationship between healthy practices and reduced use of medical benefits, and therefore reduced costs for the faculty and the institution. Additionally, there is no guarantee that in the future OU will continue to contract with BSBS, and faculty could easily lose access to this benefit, and therefore lose affordable access to exercise facilities off campus. Finally, the development of an exercise facility for faculty on campus could productively partner with the Health and Exercise Science program in providing training and a pool of potential research subjects for their students, as well as personal trainers for faculty to enhance their health practices. This is an opportunity on campus that is currently being squandered.

Jerry Weber has drafted a document that the Faculty Welfare Committee will continue to develop in the coming year, as we pursue these issues. What follows is his draft:

**Faculty Welfare Committee Recommendations for Promoting Faculty Exercise and Wellbeing**

Whether one considers the faculty the head of the university, or its heart, every observer recognizes that it is the faculty that is responsible for producing the basic product of the modern American university; the creation and dissemination of knowledge. In addition, in parlous economic times such as we are experiencing today, it is ever more incumbent among higher education institutions to do everything in their power to maintain the well-being of the faculty. Modern medicine and science tell us with clarity and conviction that encouraging, and creating the supportive environment for, physical activity is an important mechanism to support this objective.

At The University of Oklahoma, unfortunately, the physical facilities available for the support of physical activity for the faculty are sadly lacking. The Faculty Welfare Committee recognizes that some of the recommendations we offer may be, for the time being at least, financially unrealistic. However, we also proffer the observation that it is incumbent on the institution to make every effort to enhance the physical environment available for physical conditioning, as well as to create the psychological environment that encourages participation.

In addition to physical improvements suggested, we also offer the observation that a lack of facilities available only for faculty markedly diminishes the probability that faculty members will utilize the existing facilities. This refers both to workout and locker room facilities. Having looked at the overall existing facilities, we strongly support the following recommendations, offered in order of preference.

1) Building a new faculty-only facility to contain both men’s and women’s locker and workout facilities.
2) Offering cooperative participation with existing health facilities in Norman and surrounding cities. Specifically, reference is made to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield “Silver Sneakers” program.

3) Improve existing facilities. The locker rooms are dated. They are fundamentally unchanged since the building was constructed in 1981. Further, the locker rooms do not support modesty. The showers are not private and the dressing area is open. Faculty members often complain that they will not exercise at the Huston Huffman Fitness Center because of the locker rooms and the lack of privacy. The locker spaces could be friendlier to members utilizing wheelchairs. In addition, hot water is often an issue due to an old system. Facilities Management must continuously service the system. Equipment used in strength training is sometimes patched with tape as opposed to being properly repaired. In addition to discouraging use by faculty, the Huffman Center does not contribute to making OU an attractive site to potential students and parents who visit.